

ON THE
BEGINNING OF OUR HISTORY,
AND
THE LAST REVOLUTION OF THE EARTH;
AS THE PROBABLE EFFECT OF A COMET.

(*A Critique on Rhode's Work,* published at Breslau, 1819.*)

At all times, amongst all nations and classes, the origin of history and of man has always been, as it still is, before every other, that branch of study which most interests us and evokes our faculty of research. The knowledge of antiquity, which partly and in its ultimate object is similarly directed to the gratification of this natural and ineradicable inquisitiveness, occupies a very important place in our present German literature, it is promoted zealously from the most different sides, it is cultivated with corresponding success. While new treasures and sources are being continually opened for us in Indian, Persian, Egyptian documents and monuments, or important elucidations of them given to us; while even Grecian antiquity, with all that is intimately allied to it, is drawn forth from the narrow circle of ordinary philology by the deep acumen of Creuzer, leading us back to the sources of all heathen theology, we are no less conducted by a geography, that really embraces both earth and men, in Ritter's genial mode of treating it, as well as by other discoveries, whether geognostic or relating to the natural history of the earth, or by a new arrangement and utilization of what was previously known, to that point where history may undoubtedly become a science, no longer having merely a middle, but a beginning and end also. This is, however,

* J. G. Rhode Ueber den Anfang unserer Geschichte und die letzte Revolution der Erde, als wahrscheinliche Wirkung eines Kometen.

said, supposing that that can be termed a science, which in point of fact is only the common remembrance of collective humanity, as soon as everything spurious shall have been separated, and a clear interpretation added to that remembrance of the primeval period, to our own development from the beginning. From all sides this copious supply of new sources and new ideas streams in upon us, enabling us to understand antiquity completely and more correctly, so that all, which now seems still to be wanting, is a sure key for the unlocking of all these treasures, by which we may be enabled accurately to solve the riddle of the past in all its plenitude of manifold shapes. Where already such a number of lineaments, so many single words of the whole, if we may be allowed such an expression, become suddenly tinged with light, solve themselves as it were, and irradiate too much that was previously dark; there we may well hope that all can equally become clear and intelligible, so soon as the light shall radiate forth to illumine and arrange. "On the grade, which our knowledge of collective antiquity has now attained," says our author in the preface (p. 2), "every investigator will look out for a firm spot to stand on, whence he may scan the wide field of his inquiry, so as to arrange with method and system the objects as they become visible to him." I perfectly agree with him, when he adds, "According to my view, that spot for standing on, can, and should only rest on an historical foundation, which must especially be solidly established, if that be in any way possible."

The author now arranges in a twofold manner those writers who have meritoriously advanced the higher knowledge of antiquity; inasmuch as he on the one part presents to us an extremely remarkable, a very simple, and yet so explanatory an hypothesis, based on geography, concerning the last revolution of the earth and the great flood, from which also, in the author's opinion, not indeed the first history of man proceeds, but yet that history immediately affecting us, the well-known (second) commencement of history; on the other hand, however, points out in the Zendavesta the evident traces of a most remarkable concordance with this very hypothesis of his, and generally speaking is convinced that he has found in the doctrine of Zoroaster, in the sacred traditions and writings of the old Parsees, the richest and most genuine source of olden history and religion or doctrine of revelation.

As far as regards the mode in which the author treats his subject, I cannot enough praise it. Clear and lucid as his style is, so is also the current of his thoughts, simple, directed straight onward to the essential. Bold and decisive in the acceptance of a great fact, or of a new supposition, as soon as he believes himself authorized to it and finds it adequately grounded, he, nevertheless, never in any way loses himself in too systematical a working out of all the details by petty over-nice grovelling, or by rash poetical starts. In the solving of some very intricate particular mythological question, many antiquarian investigators, like those mentioned above, may, no doubt, surpass him in critical acumen and learning. His really historical sense transcends in this, that in the course of his investigation he does not disturb what is unessential, what is isolated, that he keeps much open and free for ulterior and more close determination, that he confines himself to the principal thing, and only cares to establish the grand historical main facts of primeval history, and the results so simple, but of such after-importance, that spring from them.

I perfectly agree with the author also respecting the principle in the method of his inquiries; for I hold it to be, as he does, very possible to separate what is historical from the mythical part of the old traditions, and to extract the most essential facts of universal primeval history from the web-like envelope of mythology; so soon as light shall have once pierced this chaos, that is, so soon as the firm point of commencement, or the central point itself, shall have been found for such investigations, and for the opening of man's history.

What I, however—this principle having been once accepted—can less concede or explain, is why the author in his first result (p. 6), should say, "That the history of man begins with the last great revolution of the earth;" for if, as he adds, the reminiscence of a former period remained to them notwithstanding, an element has been taken up into his assertion that perfectly neutralizes the whole. If the reminiscence of a former epoch remained, and was preserved in the only conceivable mode, by sacred tradition, by historical or poetical myth, why should not the historical be as well capable of being separated from this tradition and myth of the antediluvian period, as the author attempts to do from the subsequent myth since the last revolution of the earth? The

traditions of the first age after this revolution are also individually often dark, intricate, clouded enough. This was but natural, before the heaving elements of the preserved human race and the newly-arisen nations could have subsided anew and settled into order. It is not difficult to conceive that the saga of the primeval period, in relation to that first portion of time after the revolution during the first origin of the separated nations, would be preserved even purer and historically clearer. Now if the author finds in the Zendavesta the detailed circumstances and causes of the last great deluge given with admirable correctness (according to his by no means improbable hypothesis of it), why then perhaps other old traditions, the Indian for instance, furnish us also with very remarkable ruins and remains, traces, or hints of that very same antediluvian period. I expressly abstain as yet from mentioning here the Mosaic sacred document or primeval history, for this the author attempts to keep aloof from the train of his ideas and for the moment to set aside, fearing lest the application of it should interfere with and disturb the freedom of inquiry and a comprehensive criticism. For which reason we may well excuse him, if the historical contents of the Genesis be understood, or rather misunderstood, in the usual circumscribed manner, and be then polemically brought forward against all other old traditions. In a primitively historical inquiry, thoroughly carried out and really comprehensive in every respect, the matter would assume quite another aspect. As in a later and, compared to the other, lower region of antiquarian science, the old Herodotus, once so often reproached with being so fabulous, is now fully and universally appreciated by the most learned geographers and historians, is justified and lauded by them for his simple and candid wisdom; so likewise the more our Egyptian, Indian, Persian, and Chinese studies of the primitive age progress, the clearer our geognostical and primevally historical views become, may Moses and the Genesis, together with much new light, reattain also their ancient dignity in the most ample degree. The author does not like this string to be touched, although he actually is not opposed to the Holy Writ; yet it is singular and striking, that he should not have remarked himself, how his declaration (p. 31)—“That the probable commencement of human history occurs in the intervals between the two last re-

formations of the earth"—properly understood, so accurately agrees with the Mosaic account. A supposition, which is certainly not regarded by us as such, as a mere probability, but as an historical certainty, as much as anything can be called certain in the primitive history of man.

The last grand revolution of the earth remains the main theme of the author. That by this, in the Zendavesta also, the flood of Noah or the deluge is meant, and there assigned to the operation of the enemy of nature in the shape of a dragon-star or comet, that this is the same, which Moses likewise describes to us, is clear and indubitable from the circumstance, that the Zend myth connects the emigration of Jemjid pretty nearly with that frightful catastrophe, and this primeval king Jemjid is recognized to be a personage identical with the Shem of the Genesis.

The principal thought of the author concerning the last revolution of the earth or the deluge is this:—A great internal alteration was going on at that time in the earth, inasmuch as it very considerably deranged the axis and equator of its daily revolution, by which means also the geographical and climatical nature of the firm land was entirely changed. This great catastrophe in nature was occasioned by a comet that approached very near the earth, having risen in the southern sky, as is evident from the description of it in the Zendavesta. As far as regards the alteration of the pole, as asserted, the author relies also for its confirmation on astronomical remarks and suppositions with respect to the anomalies resulting from the measurements of degrees of latitude, such as they have been made up to the present time.

Now, since in this science of antiquity and primitive history, as in every other, the truth reposes on the evidence of "two witnesses," consequently here writ and nature, it is but reasonable, that besides the writ, as the sum of all the sacred old traditions, the other witness also, nature, that is, the spirit of geography and astronomy, as far as it has yet flourished, should be heard, so as to throw light into the darkness of the primeval world, while we are exploring there. An hypothesis of geography which, drawn up with this overpowering clearness, should unite and present so much that is acceptable from its lucid conviction and probable from its almost satisfying our doubts, has appeared not unimportant to us. I mean parti-

cularly by that only the principal fact as to the alteration of the earth's axis and equator, and to the entire climatic change of the habitable earth, that is quite naturally, not to say necessarily, connected with it. Whether a comet were the cause, as has been often thought, probable as it appears, that is for us a secondary matter. I will not meddle with that part of the subject. The real fact which throws light upon primitive history is that alteration of the equator, and in the climate of most countries. Supposing it also to be positively ascertained that a comet was the cause, we should nevertheless not lay too high and exclusive a value on the circumstance that it stands in the Zendavesta, although the mentioning of it, allowing that it really so was, must certainly be regarded as remarkable. This would be precisely as if we should allow Pythagoras to be the sole object of our admiration among the Greek philosophers, because he knew the true system of the world and the revolution of the earth about the sun, and not place a higher value on the sagacity of Heraclitus, the sublimity of Plato, the all-comprehensive penetration of Aristotle. Such a partial and too absolute an estimation of one primitive historical source, to the depreciation of all the others, ought by so much the less to be resorted to by the author, as he most justly censures a similar proceeding on the part of those who mistakenly apply the high authority of the Genesis for limiting investigation and confining the judgment.

To this must be added, that the correct astronomical interpretation of the old Asiatic documents is indisputably subject to great difficulties and uncertainty. The Tashter, for instance, which the author so decidedly considers to be the planet Jupiter, is, according to a communication made to me by a friend deeply versed in the Persian dictionaries and documents, in the Bundeheş, far more likely a fixed star; whilst others (see Creuzer, Symbol. i. p. 751, note 101, new edit.) take it to be the planet Mars. It cannot be doubted that a comet is meant in that passage of the Zendavesta, which speaks of the enemy of nature, a dragon-star, as occasioning the flood. Now whether the Zendavesta be right, whether a comet was really the cause or not, we leave this for the author to settle with the astronomers; as also the mathematically correct determination, whether the old South Pole is to be placed exactly in the fortieth or fiftieth

degree of southern latitude beneath the Cape of Good Hope. The course of the former equator, and consequently also of the tropical climate right through Asia in a south-westerly direction, and through the middle of Europe, has, nevertheless, historically, a great deal in its favour for explaining monuments actually there, and the remains of the primeval world. By this, for instance, are satisfactorily explained at once, and without difficulty, all the beds of elephant teeth in Siberia, the palms and cactuses in the strata of northern countries, and so on. In so violent and great an alteration, there can be no doubt whatever but that much which was once firm land has become sea, and *vice versa*. Thus it becomes quite intelligible why fossil human bones are found so rarely and exceptionally, as on the island of Guadalupe (p. 2), or in the Sierra Nevada of southern Spain (p. 35), although the earth was inhabited by a numerous race of men before the flood, since we can well assume that those human bones may lie in very many ways covered by the depths of the sea. It is therefore not exactly necessary to assume, according to De Lüc's arbitrary and violent conclusion (which some of our readers no doubt remember in the work of Stolberg), that all the previous land became sea in consequence of the deluge, but that the old bottom of the sea rose up, forming the actual habitable land ; an hypothesis which has the fault of being too much of a good thing. We may, nevertheless, safely assume, that a very important change in the main land took place during the catastrophe, so much so that it would be idle labour were we to attempt to define geographically on the present earth the position of the real primeval land, such as it was before the flood. Hence also the four rivers of paradise in Moses, or wherever they are alluded to besides in Asiatic traditions, as Stolberg, in the text quoted (part i. p. 380), rightly observes, must now be solely regarded by analogy as a type ; since in no part of the earth is a spot to be found, where four such streams, as there expressly mentioned, spring from one common source. This is the case, whether you consider the Phison, the only doubtful one, as St. Hieronymus did (Epist. II. 15), to be the Ganges, or look upon it as the Caucasian river.* To this must be

* I see on the Mosaic map of the world in Malte Brun's *Atlas*, that this celebrated geographer is inclined to regard not merely the Phison,

added, that in that passage of the Genesis the deeper symbolical meaning of the four rivers* is of more immediate importance, since their geographical names are evidently merely added for the depicting of the analogy; so many examples of which are similarly to be found in other passages of Scripture.† In the same manner as the author considers the great flood and the change in the earth's axis that then took place, is also explained, in some measure, although not quite sufficiently, the highly irregular and utterly rent shape of our present four or five parts of the earth, unless it would be more correct, from deeper reasons of geography, to assume only three. According to the opinion of those, for instance, who find the character of an isolated part of the world most expressed in America, not alone in the peculiar impress of all its vegetable and animal productions, but also in the conformation of its shape, approaching at least more a certain norm, where the great north and southern halves are joined by a narrow isthmus. Here then it is assumed, that Europe and Africa, originally belonging to each other, were connected by an isthmus, now burst asunder, in the straits of Gibraltar; and so likewise Australia with Asia by the chain of islands still existing. But in as much as the northern halves of these two parts of the world, Europe and Asia of the one,

but even the Gihon, as the Cux and the Araxes, and to place them in Armenia. According to this explanation, the four streams would certainly rise in one region, or nearly so. But how still remote this is from *one* source dividing itself into four rivers! The difficulty, therefore, on this side is only apparently removed. The same geographer places the land Hevilath in Southern Arabia. But as Moses expressly says, that the Phison flows around the land of Hevilath, the difficulty now becomes magnified even, and completely insuperable. Hence I perfectly agree with Stolberg, that no geographical solution or explanation is here possible.

* Compare with this, what the Apostle says (Ephes. iii. 18):—“ Ut possitis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis, quae sit latitudo et longitudine, et sublimitas et profundum.” Those four dimensions of the true life, “ which the saints recognize,” were no doubt known to man also in his originally pure condition; they may best conduce to point out to us the real meaning of the four regions of the world and the rivers of life in paradise.

† Thus in Jesus Sirach (xxiv. 32—37), the divine gifts, which proceed from the Mosaic law and Book of the Covenant, are compared to full streams of wisdom; and among these streams, three of those in paradise are named, the Phison, the Tigris, and the Euphrates.

Asia and Australia of the other, inclined together, the irregularity in consequence, as far as regards the shape of these parts of the world, thus grown together or entwined into each other, was even doubled. There is much that is very striking in this great irregularity, which might perhaps be connected with the earth's axis, as assumed by the author, but which, however, seems by no means immediately to result from it. We only remark, for instance, on the globe of the earth, how the main land extends both in Northern Asia and in America, with its whole breadth towards the north and the North Pole, while the great points to all parts of the world taper off in a direct line towards the south. In this hemisphere, moreover, the sea so preponderates, that we might also aptly term the South Pole the Water Pole of the earth. Independently then of the influence of a comet rising from this quarter, we could easily believe that the great flood broke in directly from the south, as is related in the Zendavesta. Is it not generally conceivable, quite apart from the alteration of the axis of the earth on the whole, that the main land also, and individual portions of the world, as pieces or limbs of the upper earth's coating, have been moved by themselves or thrust from their places? The irregular shape of the present main land might easily lead to such assumptions. Exclusive of the direction just alluded to of the breadth in the main land towards the north, and of the points stretching to the south, the outlines of the parts of the world separated by the sea, often appear to correspond mutually to each other in their indentures and prominences, as if they had been wrenched asunder, like as the rocky banks of a river often are, standing opposite each other. This is especially remarkable in South America; namely, on its eastern coast, and on the west coast of Africa, where both respond to each other. Much of the present irregular shape of the main land could thus be explained, on that supposition of a tide advancing from the south, and a subsequent divulsion from east to west, which, consequently, together with that direction towards the north, formed a twofold motion. If also upon the whole an external shock, as the effect of a proximate comet, was the effective cause of the flood, we need not exclude an internal alteration, metamorphosis, development, and evolution, or perhaps even disease in the organic life of the earth, from that,

which, if it did not produce the catastrophe, may have yet co-operated. Not to increase the number of possible conjectures in this higher department of geography have I permitted myself to make these allusions, but solely in order to attend to all the sides of the subject, and to pose them as questions to science. The most essential question of this kind may possibly be this, whether the shape of the main land, irregular as it actually is, may not have first ensued through the last revolution of the earth; whether the old continent, the real primitive land before the flood, may not have had a more regular and a more mathematically simple form; and if so, what? This question is of course superfluous, should the higher branch of astronomy already offer for answering it some analogies, derived from what it can know, or can with probability suppose of planetary formation. The author considers as an especially important sign for estimating the consequences of the last revolution, that only since then, upon the evidence of the Zendavesta, winter and summer should have existed, and that before the flood one season only, one perpetual summer, prevailed. Accordingly, he seems to assume, that the obliquity of the ecliptic also was then first produced; since change of seasons would essentially accompany such obliquity, no matter when or how produced.

Willingly as I assent to the main supposition of the author's respecting the last revolution of the earth, one thing still appears to be wanting. It would have been desirable, for instance, if the author had contemplated the climatical change of the earth not merely astronomically, and had not confined himself merely to the natural, historical phenomena on the surface of terrestrial life, but had extended the investigation also to the inner change effected in some manner during and by the flood, to the probable deterioration of the atmosphere in its elementary nature, as also to the consequences of this change for man himself, his diet, and the diseases to which he is subject; perhaps even to the existence thereby given to some subordinate animal productions; since in the decaying organism of a deceased individual every kind of false life and of vital organization is produced. In these and such respects we should have been glad, if the author had also introduced into the sphere of his considerations the atmosphere, the change and deterioration it under-

went during the last revolution of the earth. The air is, after all, that which is real in nature ; the atmosphere forms the proper organ of all earthly life.

Thus far respecting that which belongs to geography, in the idea of the author, the definitive decision of which, for the most part, belongs to another tribunal. I now turn to the properly historical part of the work lying before me, which more directly concerns us. Here I shall follow the author step by step ; but at the same time connect with it and prelusive introduce some few words concerning the Genesis. Not for the purpose of disputing with the author, because he has hitherto paid such little attention to Moses, and does not seem to have made himself intelligible,—for in point of fact, his judgment respecting him, only negatively expressed, can hardly be deemed one at all,—but solely to throw light on the case itself by so doing ; since this, namely the beginning of human history, is now inseparably connected with the profounder and right understanding of that sacred document ; since also, among the results of the author, those which concern the nature and essence of the first and primitive religion, appear to be the most important, which we have to consider with especial attention, to which then, what remains to be reminded concerning the primitive language, the origin of alphabetical writing, and the migration of the first human races from one common primitive land, we can easily annex as a corollary.

In a work of a kindred nature ("On the Age and Value of some Asiatic Documents," preface, page vi.) the author quotes a passage from Sir William Jones concerning the application of the Genesis to learned and historical investigations, which is of the following import : "Either the eleven first chapters of the Genesis are true, or our national religion (the Christian one) is false. But now Christianity is not false, and consequently those chapters are true." Now this is exactly the principle, which the author blames, considering it as destructive to the freedom of research ; he finds it most objectionable, and he utterly reprobates it in all those, who, even in this department of science, must needs preserve their character of mere Christian scholars and act accordingly.

In the work before us also (p. 22) he reckons among those prejudices, which must first be discarded, before the investi-

gation can at all proceed with impartiality, the assertion, "that there are and can be no older documents than those of Moses, and that all ancient traditions, for this very reason, are manifestly false." First of all, as far as regards the age of the other traditions and documents, criticism alone, and not religion, has to decide; nor is it at all evident how it can in any way affect religion, even should older traditions than the Mosaic be really discovered. It may be notwithstanding assumed as positive that this case has not as yet occurred. The actual rejection of all traditions that do not happen to coincide with the Mosaic is not by any means so unconditionally contained in that principle, as Sir W. Jones has expressed it. Categorical and peremptory for learned criticism, of grave results for historical research, as it may appear at first sight, it may be easily cleared up and explained. It is not the principle itself so immediately concerned as what follows after. If the conclusion is drawn from that phrase, that all other Asiatic documents and traditions, which perhaps only apparently contradict those of Moses, are to be at once valued as nought and utterly rejected, why then assuredly all further investigation and enlargement of our views would be cut off and annihilated. But this is by no means the case, if we would content ourselves with simply deducing from that argument, perfectly correct in itself, what really is contained in it; that we have, namely, carefully to examine and critically to inspect all other Asiatic documents and traditions, more especially to compare them with one another and with the Mosaic account. It is clear that Moses, even if we did not reverence his account as a sacred one, would necessarily appear as the first of safe guides by reason of his sublime simplicity. To attempt at least such a comparison, and until its completion to suspend and preserve unbiassed the judgment, regarding all that reveals itself as quite uncertain or too difficult for the comprehension, this is a law imposed on us by sound criticism. Sir W. Jones, notwithstanding that maxim of his, himself attempted on a great scale, with equal great comprehensiveness of judgment as deep learning, to institute such a comparison of the Genesis with the other old traditions and all the new ethnographical discoveries, in his treatise on the descent of all known people according to their three

principal races. It would do no harm if we, in accordance with that critical moderation, would assume also in a manner as possible, that we do not perhaps as yet understand, or at all events have not hitherto understood, in their full extent, the physical and historical contents of the Genesis; a supposition not in the slightest degree opposed by Christianity, as the moral instruction, which we have to derive from that commencement of the Bible, is in religion not doubtful and in the main quite independent of learned investigations. If anything, however, can serve as confirmation to the assertion, that the Genesis is no longer at all rightly understood by our criticism as hitherto applied, and by our present exegesis, it is the universal applause which the well-known hypothesis has found among so many biblical scholars, that the beginning of Moses has been blended, has grown or been interwoven from two documents—an Elohim-document and a Jehovah-document;—an hypothesis that immediately falls to the ground as soon as we have begun to understand the sense of the holy record; but I reserve it, since it is still so generally diffused, as a remarkable monument of critical error in our century, for the sake of elucidating it thoroughly on some other occasion.

Let us now compare first the view of the author concerning traditions in general, and let us see how his own ideas are at all applicable to the Genesis or stand in relation to them. The author remarks very correctly and ingeniously, that we can distinguish two different lines and threads (pp. 1 and 2) in the myth and tradition of any ancient nation; the mythic, which is directed to the commencement of all history and at all times, is interwoven with some theology or cosmogony; the other actual and appertaining to the history of each nation as its own. In history itself, however, we have again carefully to distinguish the ante-chronological part from what is already chronological. It must be confessed that it certainly is that first thread with its contents, directed to the beginning of human history with reference to God or to nature, that is especially susceptible of the mythic formation and also presents the nucleus for mythic increment; but as this is not absolutely necessary, and in the Genesis decidedly is not the case, it would be more correct to name quite simply this part of tradition the primitively-historical, according to

the essential contents of the recognition preserved in it. In the Genesis the ten first chapters form this primitively-historical part, and this part peculiarly, which alone concerns us here, we shall subsequently understand by the name of Genesis. It is to be observed, that the other constituent part, which we should prefer calling the popular-historical, need not be absolutely actual, but may also contain very much that is symbolical and typical, as indeed is the case with the popular-historical part of the Genesis, the forty last chapters in the first book of Moses, which do not here more immediately concern us. It is really surprising how it was the author did not remark how singularly applicable this perfectly correct division and idea of his is to the document of Moses, since hardly an old Asiatic tradition besides this can be found, in which the primitively-historical contents are kept so palpably and distinctly separated from the popular-historical, at the same time, however, both so naturally linked together according to the historical thread of the relation. This historical connection or linking is most conspicuous in Nimrod, at the close and in the last chapter of the primitively-historical part, and in the destruction of Babel in the eleventh chapter, which preludes the birth and call of Abraham as the beginning of the popular-historical part. Quite as palpably also in the primitively-historical part is the ante-chronological separated from the chronological. The chronological begins with Seth in the fifth chapter, but the four first chapters are ante-chronological; for, although what is related about the discovery of human arts and civic regulations in the race of Cain descends indubitably and certainly into chronological history, still it is described, and this should be carefully attended to, without chronology, forming in this manner the transition and connecting point for the chronological part and period.

Now, what principally distinguishes the Genesis in its most peculiar and limited sense, that is, those first ten chapters of a primitively-historical purport, is the hieroglyphical brevity prevailing in this section, that so forcibly contrasts with the circumstantiality and copiousness of detail in the following popular-historical part. If, also, in this latter there is contained much that is of deeper import, still it is not comprised so in single allusions, as so much is found set aside

in the first part, as if lost to all appearance. In point of fact, hardly another piece can be found in the whole circle of human language, writ, and tradition, where all is so replete with grave import and the deepest meaning, where every word and every syllable is so significant, as in this mysterious beginning of the Genesis. We cannot avoid seeing, that this hieroglyphical brevity was intentional, and in part it is not difficult to find out what this intention was immediately directed to, or by what it was determined. Moses wished by it to confine himself to what is absolutely indispensable and most requisite in primitive history, in order to prevent all mythic increment, to which this subject-matter is so congenial, since this increment could only render that profundity of revelation liable to abuse, and was especially too wholly incompatible with the vocation and the peculiar way in which he intended, and indeed was bound, to lead his people. There is another analogy, however, for explaining the intention of that hieroglyphical brevity of the Genesis, existing in the Bible itself. The corner-stone and the end of it are no less dark and mysterious than the beginning. As now the clear light which the prophet of the new covenant launches forth into the darkness of the future and the final age of this world, may indeed become manifest and intelligible to the solitary individual to whom it is useful or necessary, but for the whole, because the too clear knowledge of the future would otherwise act disturbingly, nay, on the least abuse, with frightful destruction on the present, must and will remain sealed up in that book of the Apocalypse, until the time shall have come when it is to be unsealed ; so likewise a complete knowledge of collective primitive history in the first ages of the world would have worked only disturbingly and destructively to excess on the people of Israel, which, abiding in the promise under the law, had to walk without diverging on the way pointed out to them towards the assigned goal. For this reason, therefore, was that knowledge thus kept back from them, thus shrouded in light, and only imparted in that exact measure, such as was essential to them. If, above all, we conceive the Bible as a whole, the Gospel forms as it were the middle of it, from which the light, beaming forth in a fourfold stream, illuminates all the rest, and animates it with superior life. The Genesis and

the Apocalypse, Beginning and End, are the mysterious handles of the holy vessel, which we must first rightly take hold of, so as to grasp, hold, and bear, the ark of the divine word. I embrace this opportunity of explaining unreservedly, in opposition to the author and others, my views and convictions respecting the Genesis and the right explanation of it. After all that has been just enunciated above, it will no longer be ambiguous, in the sequel it will become still more evident, in what sense I find the key mentioned above, which, well applied, is alone able to decipher the great riddle of the primitive world, and to infuse light into the chaos of the olden traditions. On the other hand, it can willingly be conceded, and should not be disregarded, that the hieroglyphical brevity of that Mosaic commencement would often enough stand in need of further amplification and of a commentary. For such a commentary, which it must be admitted is very essential, and would be highly instructive, the other Old-Asiatic, Indian, Egyptian, Persian, Chinese, traditions and documents present to us the most abundant materials, so soon as the right understanding of them shall have become accessible to us by the inner key, and with it the right order of the whole shall have been found. To consider all other Old-Asiatic traditions as mere delusive phantoms, void of all truth, would be most assuredly the greatest misunderstanding that can possibly be conceived, and never to be pardoned. If I, however, find in the Genesis a deeper meaning than that which may be spelt out of the commonest Hebrew vocabulary, I don't mean by that alone that esoteric elucidation known by the name of the Mosaic philosophy; for in this, at least in what has been so called for the last three or four centuries, there is much that is purely imaginative, arbitrary, unfounded, mingled with much that is profound and indisputably true. When asserting this, I have here principally and immediately in my eye all that is contained, and that not a little, in tradition and in the fathers of the Church, for the profounder interpretation of the Genesis; but above all, the light which the Genesis, as indeed the whole Bible, contains, from the connection existing between this whole, of which the former is a part and a member. As every great author is best explained by his own works, so likewise does the rule hold good more especially of this author, who is

justly to be termed great before all others; I am speaking of the Bible; for the divine word, even the written word, is a light which best illuminates itself, and renders itself clear. The question here, therefore, neither is nor can be concerning an arbitrary accommodation-system, but that meaning, which even with philological strictness will continue to be the sole true one, which serves, too, as the base of all sublimer criticism, that is, a criticism which comprehends the spirit, and which understands in the spirit.

We make now the application of this with immediate respect to the historical assertions of the author. He reckons Moses (p. 7) among those who have represented the last great re-formation and revolution of the earth as the creation of it, and who have connected it with the first commencement of man's history. The inaccuracy of this assertion is conspicuous, as we have already proved above, since the flood in the Zendavesta, produced by the enemy of nature and the dragon-star, is the same as Noah's, which Moses assigns to an epoch long posterior to the origin of the human race. If, however, in any part of the so-called history of creation in Moses, there is also meant a revolution or re-formation of the earth, this cannot in anywise be considered as the last (or the deluge); but it must have been another, an earlier one, and far more probably the last but one, just as the author in his way says (p. 31), "The probable commencement of the human race lies in the period between the two last re-formations." In another place he says, "That the human race at that great revolution of the earth was still near its origin, at least in comparison with the time which has since transpired, can hardly be doubted;" which, with the limitation added to it, likewise agrees very well with Moses.—Where now does the author, however, find the creation in Moses—in the first verse of the first chapter or in the following six days of creation also? In the first verse the question quite undeniably concerns the creation of all visible and invisible things; but as the earth, in the second verse, together with the water, is supposed to be already existing, and is described in its chaotic, dark, flooding state, it is evident that in the following six days of work the question cannot in any manner concern the first and proper creation of all things and the whole world from nothing, according to the Mosaic and Christian idea, but only be concerning a cosmical arrange-

ment, a reconstruction and fitting up of the earth as a dwelling-place for man, an organic vivification and filling of the same with living natures, the whole work being crowned by the creation of man. The author has here openly satisfied himself with that which is usual in the newer exegesis, by which it is easily comprehensible why his repugnance should have turned him from the bad commentaries, and even accompanied him to the text itself. In such investigations as his are, it would have been desirable, if he had rather looked around him for the old way of elucidation,* but especially had remarked with attention what really stands in Moses and what he properly himself says. Let us consider, therefore, in this respect, the whole text of the Mosaic six days of work, especially what precedes them in the first and second verse. "In the beginning God created heaven and earth;" that is, the spiritual world and the sensual world, or, as it is said in the Symbolum with evident relation to this beginning of Moses, "all invisible and visible things." He created them, and indeed in the Christian sense, which is also the Mosaic one, what "create" properly means, out of nothing. For the antithetical opinion of matter existing coevally with the world-spirit, equally eternal and consequently independent of it, which first was formed and ordered by God into the world, this opinion, which was the prevalent one among so many ancient nations, is expressly rejected and excluded by the words of Moses, and as has been often recognized by other learned men. The passage of "in the beginning," however, can here not so much apply to eternity, but, judging by the whole of the context, to the beginning of temporal creation.† In the second verse follows now at once

* It is remarkable, how carefully the expressions of the old interpreters and church-fathers are continuously selected on this subject, so that the difference is most clearly defined, and no confusion to be thought of. Thus St. Justin says in his Apology II., when speaking of the twofold cause, why the Christians celebrate the Sunday, and meet together on a Sunday, because Christ rose on this day, and principally, moreover, because this was the first day in which God changing darkness and matter, formed the order of the world : "επειδὴν πρωτη τοῖς ἡμέρα, εὐ ή ὁ Θεὸς τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὑλὴν τρέψας, κοσμοὺν ἐποίησε." How could he have selected these expressions, which evidently apply solely to a reinstitution and change of matter that had become dark, from the Mosaic history of the creation, if he had understood and regarded this as a proper first creation from nothing (according to Christian and therefore to his ideas?)

† The existence of another creation from eternity is not hereby ex-

the description of a state entirely chaotic of the earth still wholly covered with darkness. "And the earth was without form and void,"—it was still without organic life. "And darkness was upon the face of the deep;" the earth was still without the beneficial influence of the light and all that is produced by it. Nevertheless all was already present, from out of which the future, better state was to proceed; for "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Earth and water, therefore, were here already present, although floating still quite chaotically in the darkness. By so much the less, therefore, can the two first verses be regarded and explained as mere superscription and compendium, the sequel of which contains as it were the further carrying out and gradual description of it. If one would also reduce to a mere superscription the endless contents of the first verse in this manner, with respect to the recapitulation in chap. ii., verses 1 and 4, this would not at all be applicable to the second verse, which contains and describes something quite different; such a violent interpretation would be here inconceivable, and impossible to be carried out. The first day-labours of the following history of creation relate just this, how the earth was brought out of that chaotic state, as described in the second verse, how it was organically arranged and fitted up as an abode for man. In the first and third days also nothing is contained that can be referred to or explained with respect to the first production and creation of the water or the earth. They are expressly supposed to be already existing, and all that is spoken of is the separation of the superior waters—the clouds, vapours, and misty night—from the inferior, as likewise of the sea from the main land that followed that influence of the light; moreover, of the clear

cluded, only it cannot be the one meant here. Christianity,—the Bible as well as the Church,—as is well known in the positive dogma, does not decide between the creation temporarily beginning, and the one from all eternity; but it might well be the proper task of Christian philosophy to pay due attention to both, each in its place, and by this very means first render manifest and clear the mystery of the creation. As far as regards the "in the beginning," I will merely remark, that in another passage of Scripture, where the first creature is spoken of, created indeed, but created from all eternity, the passage for that very reason cannot be interpreted as referring to the Son, to whom "ab initio" is emphatically adjoined "et ante omnia saecula," in the words "Ego creata sum ab initio et ante omnia saecula," &c.

firmament of heaven, which finally separated the old conflict of mists, and of the dam, which was placed on the earth against the flooding of the primitive waters. The question, therefore, here is not concerning the first creation of the earth ; but it was a re-institution, a new re-formation and fitting up of the earth, which preceded the creation of man, and precisely for this ultimate object was it arranged and disposed in order to serve him as an abode. Now, if all doubt be removed from this side, a question difficult to solve remains on the other. How does Moses, after his brief allusion to the primitive creation of all things, allude all at once to that chaotic state, which he describes with such wonderful energy in a few traits ? Is God, the living God of Moses, a God who can create a chaos, the well-known Thohu and Bohu, an "earth without form and void ?" This is not conceivable. Equally so, nay still less, can an uncreated chaos be assumed as coexistent with the true God, which would also be an absolute contradiction to the first verse. There is consequently a great gulf between the first and the second verse ; not that it is an accidental hiatus, for assuredly nothing whatever is there, but with the deepest design. In order to fill it, it is also only permitted us to make that present, to re-present to our minds in short that which is actually certain from the Bible and Moses himself. God has created all beings good, and can have created no chaos. If spirits, however, which were free, fell off from God, the chaotic disorder, as the result of such lapse, is easily conceivable. This essential main dogma of the Christian revelation forms the basis everywhere of the Bible, of the Mosaic account itself, and is alluded to in countless passages. That desolator and founder of all disorder and darkness, that liar from the beginning, whom Moses immediately after introduces under the type of the serpent, without having previously spoken of his creation or his fall, which he silently presupposes, as well as so much besides, him we must think of as explicative of the passage. Not indeed as an arbitrary interpolation into the text of holy writ, but as a mere complement in our thoughts, as an elucidation for our understanding. In this manner the beginning of Genesis by this explication might be commented upon somewhat as follows :—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," that is, the spiritual world and the sensual world ; (but after that the first of created spirits had

fallen off from God, and had drawn down into perdition a great part of creation with him, thus—"the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep," and so on. So soon as the two first verses of Moses are properly understood, and the one main and fundamental error be removed, which confuses the contents of the two first verses, the following six days of work, the first creation of all things out of nothing, with the new formation of the world before the creation of man, then all obscurity disappears more and more from the parts which follow, and at all events the whole as it proceeds becomes clear and intelligible.

The calling forth and the first beaming of light is the fruitful germ from which, as the first point of beginning, the successive acts of this new cosmical arrangement and superior re-formation of the earth proceed in obedience to God's behest. The four first days of work and periods serve for giving to the earth that arrangement which it required as an habitation for man. No sooner were light and darkness separated, when the murky volume of clouds opens and disparts also, the firmament of heaven vaults itself in its bright clearness over the earth ; sea and land divide and gain a firm boundary, and from out of the watered earth herbs and plants mount towards the light. Before it was yet day upon earth, before the beginning of light, in the old night, when the earth was still dark, sun and moon could not act upon it, were not present for it ; but now the star of day and the lesser one of the night appeared and acted ; they warmed and vivified the excited earth, and the glancing heavenly bodies began their sidereal revolutions. In the fifth and sixth days of work the earth is filled with living creatures, all of them subjected and serviceable to man, and the work closes with that, which is the crown and object of the whole,—with the creation of man ; whereupon after the completed work comes the seventh day of rest, or Sabbath of God, as type of the human one according to the Mosaic dispensation. As the first moment of creation, in this work of the new formation of the world, is sufficiently expressed in the fiat of light through the eternal word, so also is this second in the creation of man ; it is distinguished and exalted as such by both the importance and sublimity of the expression, that are quite unmistakable. On the other hand, in other minor productions allusion is made to a not immediate

bringing forth, as in the words, "And let the earth bring forth grass and herb ; and the earth brought forth grass," &c.

If now the question should arise, what is then properly the main fact, that in an astronomical sense forms a base for the first days of work in this first Mosaic re-formation of the earth ; this question would be perhaps not unanswerable. It would certainly of necessity be quite a simple fact, from which might easily be derived all that part of the Mosaic description having reference to geography or the science of the earth ; for the creation of man in the divine image remains a subject independent of the rest, and appertains to another superior sphere of inquiry. The following thought may at all events be posed here as a question for our scientific knowledge, for our mental construction of the primitive edifice of the world. If we suppose for a moment that the earth once completed its revolution round the sun differently from what it now does, without daily rotation round its own axis, but somewhat as the moon about the earth, consequently with the same disk continually presented to the sun, or else as turning only once in the year round its axis ; if we then would lay this question before any man versed in natural philosophy, how under such a supposition the earth at that time could possibly be constituted, the answer doubtless would upon the whole be to this effect : That the earth then could neither produce nor contain organic life, at least not any that would deserve to be called such in our sense according to the present constitution of it, exactly as Moses says, "The earth was without form and void." Moreover he would say, that without the vivifying influence of day and night, the earth might very possibly have been in that chaotic, dark-waving state, which Moses so emphatically depicts in that passage. Now, let the life-awaking beam of light radiate into the internal force, into the heart of the earth, and with the daily rotation on its axis let the pulse of its superior planetary life begin, then all that succeeds will spontaneously follow as it were. The light cleaves the clouds, the old heaving masses of mist open, the firmament of heaven spreads out above the body of the earth, on which both sea and land separate themselves also out of the heaving chaos. Vegetation bursts upwards from the moistened earth towards the light ; the earth is now adapted for being filled with organic life of every description. If it

should be replied, that the supposition is impossible, because our planet from all eternity, according to a necessary law of nature, must have had its daily rotation on its own axis, we should require the most rigid proof of that. Some people are very apt to be far too prodigal with their supposed "eternal laws," since the development of nature, everywhere gradual, has been now again recognized by the masters of science, although not even yet perhaps to a sufficient extent, both in individual things and throughout the universe at large. If, however, the supposition be conceded as possible, all that follows becomes clear, and disengages itself quite naturally from that all-efficient point of beginning, the first radiation and impingement of light called forth by God, and which begins with the daily rotation on its axis of the earth. Of this ever memorable event, it then is with truth so graphically said, "And God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening and the morning were the first day." These last words need now no longer be explained in a general, half-figurative sense, for they are at the same time also literally true. Our natural philosophy also will not be disinclined to recognize the miraculous nature of this first commencement of light, as likewise the development, so immeasurable as to its results, that ensued from that one life-fact of the daily rotation. Nevertheless, between all the fulness of organic development in life and the last in Moses,—"the creation of man in the divine image," there still remains an unfathomable gulf, which no natural philosophy can ever fill up, for here it treads on ground not its own, where the investigation with the subject itself passes away from the region of natural development into the region of immediate revelation of the inner divine Being. We also can allow, without any scruples, what the author says (page 41), and even say with him, "As the earth was ripe for bearing the present crown of its organization, he appeared upon his stage." Only the word "present" might lead us too far. Singularly enough, however, he adds, "But the time may come, when in the stream of development this period of the earth shall pass, in the collective relations of which the organism of man lay; he may at some time hereafter, in a still higher generated state of the earth, adhering as too

heavy, too much to the mass, sink without support, or pass over into still more spiritual forms." How clearly do we see here, that no sooner do we leave the firm ground of divine revelation, which teaches us to recognize that great mystery of God's image in the nature of man, and by that very means also to understand first the commencement of human history, what a boundless space is opened to us for scientific fancy to sport in ! If the spiritual spark, for it can hardly be called divine on this occasion, if then the spiritual spark in man, which properly makes him man—call it reason and capability of speech, freedom or fancy—could be attached to this or that animal form, be degraded into it or again subtracted from it, we cannot fail perceiving why this should not be equally applicable to the past. The author might then, with quite as much reason, have been able to seek out for the men of the primitive world among the numerous races of elephants or the mammoths of primeval antiquity, as he opens to us, for the future, the prospect of man's transition into "still more spiritual forms." Since he by these forms does not understand, as we others do, the illumined bodies of the risen, but to all appearance only a lighter and a more pliant animal form and genus, somewhat as the winged inhabitants of the air may already give us an example, supposing us to have guessed the bold fancy of the author by a right conjecture.

We have thus followed to their extreme limits the natural-historical view and the hypothesis of the author. What has been hitherto said may serve as a first intimation for showing that the Genesis may be regarded differently from what the author appears to have done up to the present time. Now that we have therefore put aside that, which relates to geography in the primævo-historical time, to the old traditions and sacred documents treating of it, let us pass at once to the fourth result of the author concerning the primitive religion, and which is intimately connected to what has preceded. That which is contained in the second and third results concerning the primeval land after the last revolution of the earth, concerning the primitive people and their first emigrations, the primary language, together with our remarks thereon, will best remain for the close. The fourth result of the author is now as follows :—

"There was a primitive religion, from which all the religions of antiquity have proceeded."

Undoubtedly the original religion in the first age of the world was only one; it was a religion of nature, that is, a veneration and adoration of God in nature, and of nature in God. All heathenism has arisen from this natural religion of the primitive world by further development, formation, or depravation. On this grade of heathenism stood the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans; the Indians stand thereon still; as also the Mahomedans, together with the Jews, have continued to stand, or have sunk back upon the second grade of a prophetic religion of law. That first natural religion is followed, for instance, by a second epoch in the history of religion, which the author himself recognizes as such, and very appropriately denominates the doctrine of revelation, or after his fashion of expressing it, "saga of revelation" (page 65 and *passim*); this is that religion which is no longer confined to the universal revelation of God in nature, but is founded on a special revelation (true or accepted as such), in the person of a religious founder, sent for this purpose, who for the most part is at the same time the national lawgiver, and who founds the newly announced religion on a written law. Among these the author himself will of course include the doctrine of Zoroaster besides that of Moses. Of these religions now in the second epoch, which are founded on a special revelation and a written law, it cannot well be said "that they have proceeded from the primitive religion." On the contrary, it is the depravation, the degeneration of the primitive religion, which gave rise to the religion of the revealed law, the founders and announcers of which, for the most part, found themselves diametrically opposed to, or in a continued struggle with, the old heathenism. When they, however, stepped forward also as the restorers of the purer, older, or oldest religion, they were essentially distinguished from this latter by the peculiar and new basis of a special revelation, and by the form of a written law. Hence Zoroaster, in his whole character as the proper founder of a religion, entirely belongs to this second epoch; and we cannot avoid observing why the author wishes to thrust him back to a far earlier period (p. 4), since the Zend books themselves contain no authority for so doing, and historical evidence is

all against it. If Pliny and other ancients speak of one or of several still older Zoroasters, this on the one hand is a very common shift, so as to be enabled to unite all, however heterogeneous or irreconcilable, that is somehow ascribed to a great national founder in the primitive age. On the other hand, it could be also very naturally referred to the former enlightened teachers in the Zend or Parsee tradition, especially to Hom or Heomo, at the time of Jemjid, and to the still older Hosheng, from which latter the worship of fire is derived. But both these personages belong to the first era of the world; they are Pishdadians, saints of the primitive world, and witnesses of the truth before the written law of the great Persian-Median religious founder. (Creuzer, i. p. 670.)

Heathenism is in sooth capable of the very greatest diversity in its local development, precisely because it is a religion of nature, just as the fancy happens to cull from the endless abundance of nature what most pleases it, and as that nature reveals itself in the immediate neighbourhood, it shapes out also further what it has so culled. But because it is a religion of nature, and so long as it remains only as such, is it essentially one and the same. The most important difference, the most important in its consequences, is that which takes place between the cult of the elements and of fire, as obtaining with the shepherd and nomad tribes, and between the sideral natural worship of agricultural nations. Even here there is, however, no positively absolute separation; transitions and comminglings between both kinds of the old natural worship are plentifully found. The sole difference that might be first established between that which is essentially one in its first foundation, though capable of an infinitely varied evolution, would be the one between a heathenism with God, and a heathenism without God. A heathenish religion entirely without God will not easily be found, at least among those nations who possess a tradition and are historically known to us. Thus here again, also, everything rests on a More or Less, on the degree of strength and clearness with which, or on the different form in which, the idea of the true God steps forth from the chaos of natural mythology. Here now is the point where I must separate from the author, inasmuch as he does the greatest injustice to

the original, pure heathenism of the primitive world, when he asserts, that for it "God and nature were still one" (pp. 22. and 59), that they consequently knew nothing whatever of the true God, did not recognize God in nature, regarded, however, nature in God, worshipped only in the main nature solely and alone. This would be in itself clearly considered, not well imaginable, for we cannot well assume that error preceded truth. Moreover it is contradicted by all historical evidence, all old traditions and documents. It rather suits our modern men of science and natural philosophers to lose God in nature, and that both should become one. Even our author speaks once quite incidentally of "eternal natural laws;" a phrase which we can pardon in the mouths of regular men of science and ordinary natural philosophers for denoting that, which nature has once accepted and presupposed, which appears to be equally necessary with her, and is recognized as such. It should, however, be excluded in primitively historical research, which requires the greatest accuracy of expression. What can be named eternal in nature, that is not to be sought for in laws, but in that which is exalted above the laws, and which precisely by this proclaims itself as free and divine. Should the author, however, really consider nature as eternal, I should much like to hear how he has acquired this remarkable knowledge. In the olden time that interchange and blending of God with nature does not at all take place in the manner the author presumes, not even there where naturalism predominates. Very definitely can we distinguish and extract in the old heathen religions the idea of the true, or in order to denote it very markedly in contradistinction to naturalism, of a supersensual, transcendental, or metaphysical God, from the polytheistic additaments and the mythological accompaniments. The difference is here only solely this, that in some systems of heathenism, as in the Indian, Persian, and Chinese, partly also in the Egyptian, which in this respect forms the transition to the Grecian mythology, the metaphysical idea of God, much as this idea may be polytheistically deformed subsequently, nevertheless forms as it were the core and the soul, the centre, beginning, and summit of the whole. On the other hand, in the heathenism of the Greeks, and of kindred nations, the same idea becomes completely covered and

obscured by mythology, and only breaks out in detached passages, as especially in the mysteries; here and there, too, out of them, and then in a manner that is entirely unmistakable. With respect to the Greeks, this will scarcely require any further proof after Creuzer's great researches. The definition, so entirely metaphysical, of the supreme God, in the Indian and Persian sacred books, is evident to any one. Concerning the religion of the other old nations, it will be easy to decide from these fundamental traits, whether they belong more to the one or to the other class. The Jehovah of Moses, say more recent critics, is a mere national God of the Jews; but the word itself is already quite metaphysically formed (the Indian Suayambhu, may, first out of the old languages, correspond to it); this is still more confirmed by other Mosaic definitions of the same God, as, The "I am" sends Moses, "I am, that I am." Thus this name of Jehovah, according to its entire etymology, may signify nothing else, save him, who is there and is manifest, who was there and will be there; not being in the indefinite universal ens, generally speaking, but being there, that is, existing, that is, manifesting or revealing himself. This four-formed (*tetrapyrappmarov*) and mysterious name therefore defines especially the God of Revelation, on which account the older Latin church language translates this word every time by DOMINUS. That Jehovah, regarded also historically, is, according to Moses, not merely a national God, and not merely peculiar to the Jews, is clear from the blessing of Noah, where it is expressly said, may Jehovah be the God (the Elohi) of Shem and his posterity;* that is, in other words, the descendants of Shem are not without a knowledge of the true and living God. We should here peculiarly think also of the Persians, who descended from the race of Shem, their religion being always so carefully and evidently separated in Scripture from actual idolatry: strictly taken, it cannot be classed with heathenism, for the Persians were imbued with a similar abhorrence like to that

* In the usual Protestant German translation of the Bible this is not correctly given, inasmuch as the two denominations of God, which the Vulgate at all times very carefully distinguishes, are arbitrarily confounded, so that it now reads, "Blessed be God, the Lord of Shem," instead of being as in the real text, "Blessed be Jehovah, the Elohi of Shem," by which transposition the deeper meaning is entirely lost.

which pervades the bible of the Egyptian sideral idolatry ; so that it is almost saying too little, when a talented English scholar very aptly names the Persians the puritans of heathenism. In the blessing of Noah, that benefit of the real knowledge of God is still much more extensively increased, as it is openly said of Japhet in the same relation, “ he shall dwell in the tents of Shem;” which also at this present time has so abundantly been fulfilled among the western nations mostly descended from Japhet. The first general primitively historical part of the Genesis cannot have been at all attended to, or understood, if in this respect Moses is reproached with an intolerant narrow spirit of nationality. On a closer inspection, it will much rather become clear, that Moses it is who gives us the correct and pure idea of the simple natural religion prevailing in the primitive world, such as it was before Judaism and the religion of the written law, and from which all heathenism derived its origin.

What properly confines and impedes the author in this entire question concerning the origin and the original constitution of religion is the difficulty, not easily solved it is true, which he well feels, how the idea of the true God first occurred to man and generally speaking could enter his mind. As the author, among the various attempts to answer this question, mentions, among the other essays, my own assertion, contained in the work of mine, entitled “On the Language and Wisdom of the Indians,” that this could only take place by an immediate revelation, but which as well as all the others appear unsatisfactory to him (pp. 48 and 59), I will briefly attempt a very definite explanation of it. This is one of those points where primitively-historical research comes into unavoidable contact with philosophy ; a contact which the author would fain elude, but which, in this latter part of his work, he can in nowise avoid. Now, if it is a free, living philosophy, not such a one as founds a system from abstractions, we cannot then well see how such a philosophy could exercise any disturbing influence on primitively-historical research, which the author very justly could only be apprehensive of from that philosophy which is shrouded in a system hampered in a maze of abstractions. Concerning the origin of the idea of God in man, the following modes of explaining it, or nearly so, are employed. If this idea is

begotten and produced by the reason through itself and from its own personality, the origin of the idea of God is also equally explained from itself; only the existence of God out of the idea, and apart from it, is then inexplicable; this idealistic difficulty, not being by any means the opinion of the author, we shall not enlarge upon, as this view is besides, in its full strictness, peculiar to a few thinkers only, and can never become a general mode of thinking. By so much the more generally is the opinion diffused, which supposes the natural man attains the idea of God from mere sensual perceptions, images, and feelings, by a gradual exaltation, purifying and refining of them; where the idea then appears to be in itself a compound one and relative to its origin as accidentally occasioned, it consequently loses all reality; the author appears to lean to this latter view in one respect which we shall hereafter further allude to, though he upon the whole admits the unsatisfactory nature of this explanatory mode also. In point of fact it is but a mere mock-thought, which, if we attempt to throw light more nearly upon it, does not become clear and intelligible, cannot indeed be worked out by thought. In its very best sense, and most favourably interpreted, it could only be explained as a re-finding and a gradual stepping forth of the idea of God, which then must have been implanted previously in man. This last is the base of the third acceptation, of which we are the advocates. What we call reason and other similar qualities and powers, that we distribute and apportion to men, they are but mere distributions and qualities on the surface of the outward semblance of man. In his real inward essence, man consists of two things only—mind and soul. This is precisely the essence of man, that he is not mind alone, but a mind that is united to soul and forming with it one. Now, if the mind as well as the soul have and can have originally no other object save God, if He is the first thought of every created mind and the original object of the sentient soul, why then the idea of God is to be considered as innate in man. It is now no longer inexplicable how this idea can be developed in him even by an external cause and can be again elicited, since it lies originally in him. This reawakening is always possible to whatever degree mind and soul may be diverted, perplexed, confused by other and external objects; because the thought,

which is to be evoked anew, was for both the first, the original one. We may also aptly term such a reawakening of the innate idea in man of God a reminiscence, in the Platonic or in some similar sense. This reminiscence, however, remains imperfect so long as it is nothing more than such, and only a faint presentiment, in an image as it were, of what it would fain substantially comprehend. A vast chasm still lies between this presentiment and the immediate consciousness of his Being, which can only be effected and explained by the object itself, by actual contact with God. Why should this, if it was from the beginning, be not possible also in every subsequent period, although surpassing the earthly sense? Because this inner ray of the Eternal beams forth since all time, and the immediate conscious perception of the Divinity is at once there, swiftly and rapidly as the lightning is kindled before our sensual eye; it is hence named illumination, like the creative commencement of light in nature. Such is the maxim posed in this view, that all recognition of God depends on immediate illumination. Now, if to this illumination an external direction and operation, a mission and divine command be adjoined, then it is what is denominated in a special sense a personal revelation, what is attributed to the proclaimers and founders of the true religion and living recognition of God. Belief or faith, however, is the adhering to an illumination not its own, it is an apprehending and comprehending of it, which without some inward illumination of its own is not conceivable, if the belief shall not be a mere external one, that merely utters the letter without reflection, and, therefore, properly would be also without internal conviction. Thus everything comes back to the principle of illumination, as the first source for the recognition of God. In the hope that this explanation will now be sufficiently palpable and definite, I will, in order to obviate all misconception, annex, that consequently, in conformity with this principle, metaphysics form an entirely empiric and positive science, "which cannot be communicated to those who do not possess of it the idea that results from experience." This is, however, reserved for another commentary; let us here apply what has been laid down to the constitution and nature of the primitive religion. I understand One originally good and true religion in a far

more ample sense than the author does; and it will now be easy to explain how I could assert, that the original and pure heathenism, of which we now find almost everywhere only the degenerate state, was the true religion of nature, which recognizes God in nature, but also surveys nature in God, without regarding on that account "both as one." It was this illumination which the saints of the primitive world possessed, and which also Moses expressly attributes to some of them. If now this divine illumination be not lost sight of, we can also concede another natural subordinate one as coexistent, that "mental instinct," for instance (p. 59), by means of which the men of the primeval world, because they themselves still stood in a closer and more intimate psychical contact and connection with nature, and by this, notwithstanding they were without our machines, experiments, and calculations, knew much of nature, recognized with perfect clearness, wielded and used with perfect facility what we, with all our reckonings and machines, are not able to comprehend yet so correctly. Since all the analogies of natural science and so many historical facts, which otherwise would remain wholly inexplicable, speak for this assumption and this higher psychical view to be employed here, it appears only to be a sceptical wilfulness of the author, when he wishes to set this aside with such peremptory abruptness (p. 59).

The illumination, however, which was the source of religion among the saints of the primeval world, is to be carefully distinguished from the special revelation and personal mission of the proper founders of religion, of the prophetic national lawgivers, who belong to the second era of the world. It is remarkable what the Genesis shortly imparts concerning some pious and illuminated men of the first age. The first purely historical mentioning of this description is that of Enos, who first addressed Jehovah by that name; that wonderful and mysterious name, "before which all knees shall bend, that are in heaven and earth and beneath the earth." In the text it says, as is well known, "in whose time" the name of Jehovah was first invoked. Although the compiler or arranger of the Vulgate may have had his peculiar reasons for preparing that reading, which ascribes personally to Enos this new and great event, the discovery of

prayer, or whatever else may be contained in it ; still this is by so much the more evident, that Enos, on this account, is by no means to be considered as a proper founder of religion in the later sense. To this remote age, therefore, does Moses assign the age of the pure adoration of Jehovah ; of Enoch however (the Idris of the modern Orientals, and the Kapila of the Indians, to whom the oldest Indian philosophy is assigned, at a time previous to the whole development of their degenerate mythology, and long antecedent to the comparatively modern Vedanta-system), of this Enoch, known also to the other Asiatic traditions, Moses says, " he lived in God,"* mentioning and repeating three times the name of Elohim, by which, in such a respect, an especial divine spiritual force and illumination are at all times implied, somewhat as in later times the wonderful Elias is named a man of Elohim ; so that " he lived in God," if we might be allowed a certain circumscription, might be best termed—" he walked in the strength of Elohim." Of Noah, it is said again, he found grace before Jehovah ; and, moreover, he lived in God ; or as we have attempted to express it, " he walked in the strength of Elohim." In this saint of the Mosaic primitive world we meet again with the theory of the author. He makes a broad distinction between the proper idea of revelation and the mere pious natural feeling of the primeval ages ; he endeavours also to explain in his own way the origin of the first, which appears to him to have always been unsuccessfully attempted as yet. The horrid event of the last revolution of the earth, where nature showed herself so dire and hostile to man, led, in the grateful feeling of being saved, to the idea of a Being, exalted above nature, quite distinct from it ; that from this the doctrine of revelation sprang. Thus the French antiquity-philosophers derive the origin of all religion from that frightful catastrophe to the world, and assign its commencement to fear, to a fancy excited by terror. The author has taken up this view in a more noble and enlarged view, inasmuch as he attributes it more to a feeling of gratitude towards the great Saviour than to a feeling of terror at that awful event. We may accept and understand, I admit,

* In God ; in order to express at one and the same time all the significations of the particle Eth־, with and to God.

quite in this sense the great thank-offering and natural sacrifice of Noah in the Mosaic account ; and, indisputably, that dread event in nature must have conduced in many ways to awaken religion and the feeling of God, to reanimate it, or to give it a new direction. The idea of God, however, could not have been first attained by man in consequence of this, if it had not been originally implanted in him. But in no way is it correct to consider as the whole, to wish to pass it off as such, what is only *one* moment in the history of the oldest religion, and what forms only one moment in the question respecting the origin and the first development of the same. The last, whom Moses mentions in a similar relation and designation, is Melchisedek, who, although he lived in the time of Abraham, yet as being such before the call of the latter, must be classed with the before-mentioned saints of the primitive world. By this very circumstance he forms a new point of union, through which the popularly historical part of the Genesis becomes linked to the primitively historical part (*see above*). Although he is named a priest of the most high God, in a threefold repetition of this special divine name (El Eliun), and as such, offers to Abraham a type of the highest bloodless sacrifice (according to the pious custom of the primitive world), he can, nevertheless, standing quite alone and apart, be regarded, in nowise, and quite as little as those named before, as a proper religious founder, and as a prophetic lawgiver. To this class, which dominates over the second era of the world, belongs, above all, besides Moses, Zoroaster ; then the Indian Gautama, as that mind, which altered everything in India (who founded the Nyaya philosophy, who gave rise to the Vedanta-system as an antithesis to the former, and restored the equipoise against innovation by the remodelling of the old doctrine). His historical name is called by the numerous followers of his religion Buddha (*sapiens, intelligentia, verbum*) ; moreover, Confucius and other prophetic national legislators down to Mahomet. All these were no common, ordinary men, but men fitted with extraordinary qualities and gifts. Whether, however, it was merely a sideral natural force, or also a bad and demoniacal mental power ; or, whether it was the spirit of God, the force of Elohim, and the light of Jehovah, which impelled them, and in which they taught and worked ; this

must certainly be first investigated and attentively deliberated on. Undoubtedly, the idea of God must have become thoroughly clear and certain to ourselves, before we can decide between the true and the false revelation, which subject cannot be further discussed in this place.

Now that we have seen in what manner Moses relates the knowledge of the true God, even in the primitively historical time of the first mundane era, and before the people of Abraham,—how he significantly and pointedly alludes to it in the four points, each constituting an epoch, of Enoch, Noah, and Melchisedek,—it is now the place to say a word concerning the view of nature as contained in his account, how it is enunciated especially in the primitively historical part of his sacred tradition, in the history of that first time, when no written law had as yet been given, and when man recognized God only in the revelation of nature, but viewed nature, however, in God. Every kind of natural cult, or even of natural worship, is of course strictly excluded from the Mosaic document. This does not efface the visible presence of a pure adoration for the divine principle in nature, a deep contemplation of all the essence and action in nature. Let us cast a look now in this respect on the Mosaic history of the earth's creation. Much that is both bright and clearly defined starts at once to our view; much, too, is passed over in silence, or with brief allusion, as if lost, placed in the background, which is not unoften the case in the Genesis, as also in the representation of nature and the earth's formation. Thus the first breath of life, that which is properly alone real in nature, the element of air, is nowhere expressly and emphatically mentioned, except where Jehovah Elohim breathes the "breath of life" into the son of earth formed of loam (ch. ii. v. 7). In the second verse of the history of the creation, commented on above, where the Spirit of God moves upon the waters before the commencement of the new formation of the earth, as the question concerns an influence purely local and defined, entirely physical and divine, and the word Ruach רוח means besides "the breath of life," we can also conceive, a natural medium of the divine force and omnipotence, in the universal element of life, the air, as preparing the creative act of nature's palingenesis. In the Mosaic formation of the earth, however, and in his mode

generally of representing nature, light occupies the first place, as we have sufficiently had opportunity above of showing and referring to. As generally, in the biblical doctrine and language, grace in man is so often represented under the figure of light, so by alternation is light depicted in Moses, and other parts, as the immediate divine principle, as a beam of grace in nature dispensed by God, not indeed absolutely and independently, but revered and exalted as a herald and announcer of God's majesty. In the Mosaic formation of the world, light is the first awakener and exciter of higher earthly life, the great renovator in nature, which in its passage parts the old confusion, and creates order in that which is now separated clearly and firmly. In the first series of the Mosaic days of work, the element of light is successively followed by water, earth, and by the plants that spring towards the light out of the earth made teeming by water; all of them elements or productions of nature closely allied. Fire is nowhere expressly mentioned, as light is, although it otherwise serves in Moses not merely as a figure or type, but even as the medium for the appearing of God in the pillar of fire, in the flaming bush, &c. Fire, abstractedly considered, is more an element of destruction for annihilation or purification, than a principle of life and the forming of the world; only when moderated, veiled and latent does it work as such in the warmth of the sun, or as vital flame in the veins of creatures animated with blood. In this form and respect it is fundamentally placed in the second series of the Mosaic days of work, where the ordering of the vivifying stars, and the production of living inhabitants on the earth, in all departments of nature, are briefly reported. The genial warming sun, and the moon (the latter powerfully influencing fermentation, growth, and production, according to the view of all ancient nations and many modern natural philosophers, is always to be considered a principle of vital warmth, even if very much depressed), lead us, as the ruling luminaries of day and night, back again to the light, which in Moses forms the beginning, and always remains the first. The abundance and fruitfulness of the living creatures of the earth, in their nourishing and propagation of numerous races, are considered and praised here with delight, as well as often in subsequent passages, by Moses, as a living blessing of

God. The return to the light, however, is here also given and implied by the thing itself, in the living creatures animated with blood, especially in man, the crown of all earthly ones. From the water, or from the earth made fruitful by water, the plant grows up towards the light and lives through it; and yet the flower, as summit of the plant, although entirely surrendering itself and inclining towards the light, is only a longing after it, that remains unsatisfied, and does not break forth into the real eye. It is the eye, and not immediately the voluntary movement, which many genera of animals have in so slight a degree, or almost not at all, and which the plants on the other hand periodically reapproach; it is the sun-percipient eye* that makes the animal such, and the living what they really are; the eye which, in the crown of all mundane living things, in man, directed straight, like the flower, to the light, beams forth in the wonderful circle of his face itself as a double sun. Now what is this external light, and the visible sun, in comparison with the inward eye, by means of which man sees the light in his mind, which shines everlasting, and by this alone becomes an image of God, a fulgence and reflection of his glory? Thus, on the sixth day of work is closed with man what was begun on the first with light; and in the seventh division of time follows now the repose of God, after the entire completion of the work. If the light, as the most spiritual thing in the sensual world, forms the sole tropical point, which we also find again among the other old Asiatic nations in similar dignity, the other is visibly found in the peculiar biblical view respecting the blood, how it is the soul-conferring and hidden vital fire in all living things, the secret laboratory and the sanctuary of life, hallowed by God, which is susceptible of so many injuries, and for that very reason to be treated with the most prudential awe. Thus it is said of Abel, not to mention the bloody sacrifices, that his blood cries out to God from the ground, which had opened its mouth to receive it from the hand of the murderer. When man, too, after the flood, instead of his previous mild vege-

* " Were not the eye sunlike,
How could it catch the power of the light?"

is said in a beautiful old (German) verse, a proverbial saying which has been taken up and applied extensively in philosophy.

table diet (ch. i. v. 29) of a happier primeval world, had assigned to him for food living creatures,* he is at the same time warned not to touch the blood. Yet now, remarkably enough, immediately after the terrible catastrophe in nature, the law is also proclaimed of legal blood-vengeance and retaliatory putting to death. The view in the Bible respecting blood, as the other tropical point of the Mosaic contemplation of nature, penetrates into the very core of the Mosaic law. Hence we cannot here follow this thread any further. In what sense, however, also, according to Moses, the cult of the primitive world was a religion of nature, that is peculiarly evident from what is said at the creation and mission of Adam, of his original relation to nature, over which he is placed as lord and ruler, as a real king, and consequently also as high priest of the same, as it is only to serve and be used to the glorification of God. In this sense, and in the function of a king and high priest of nature, must the passage be explained and interpreted, where it says of Adam that he gave their names to all living things on the earth. As to the so-called origin and first lisping of a semizooic natural language, according to the modern favourite interpretation (that is, abolition and explaining away of the divine mind), this passage can, for that very reason, not be understood, at least not in our view and signification of language, because it is expressly said "Jehovah" brought all creatures before Adam, to whom he then gave their names. Such things do not stand for nought in Moses. Even our usual representations of a blissful sloth of man in Paradise are not quite correct, nor Mosaically authorized. Adam is expressly placed by God in Paradise, "to dress it and to keep it." "To keep it," that is, to defend it; fighting against the enemy, who yet contrived afterwards to creep in.

* Man has the teeth of both genera of animals, the carnivorous and those which feed on plants. From this, however, merely follows, that he was destined and organically constituted to enjoy a great variety of different articles of sustenance, and also when dressed. For to assume that man was originally created a carnivorous rapient animal, is opposed to all probability, contradicting point blank the plainest declarations in the oldest and most sacred traditions, that the first food of man was a vegetable one, decidedly also to be hardly reconciled with Christianity, and the view which this and Christian philosophy gives us of the first man and his original condition.

"To dress it," certainly not for the common necessities of life, as afterwards, when "the ground was cursed for his sake;" therefore to what other object should it be cultivated, unless to the ever greater glorification of God?

Now that we have put aside or opposed with fitting argument all that concerns the science of the earth and the last revolutions of it in the primitively historical research of the author, moreover have dilated on the origin and the original nature of religion, touching on the Zendavesta and everything which the author deems remarkable in it, also the properly understood sense of the Genesis, and all this as copiously as was here possible, we turn now to the author's opinion of the primitive language, this being the subject most nearly allied to the foregoing. In sooth it is with the investigation into the origin and original constitution of the first language, as with the question concerning the origin of religion. The point is here just as it was there; whether we shall begin forthwith with that which really is the first everywhere, with the mind in its effectivity, or shall attempt to worm out the mind gradually from the sensual maze, to fasten it on behind as an accidental excrescence. It was remarkable to us, how the author does not so much hold the middle path between both these opinions as he is divided between them. The one opinion, which makes language artificially work itself up by degrees to a form of reason and a spiritual importance from out of a mere animal cry or of an utterance that imitates a sound in nature, receives the author's sanction by the maxim (p. 43, and the following pages), that the primitive language must have been monosyllabic. The other opinion, which considers that language may have very possibly commenced with the purest and with a spiritual importance, and which regards the less cultivated languages as degraded ones, so far captivates him, that he sees and acknowledges the inward inseparable connection (p. 76) between the polysyllabic, organically articulated and constructed language, and the wonderful discovery (p. 73) of alphabetical writing. Nevertheless, it is necessary that we at once remove to entirely historical ground in this investigation, for the primitive language—properly so to be termed, and at all events decidedly ante-historical—is separated by too wide a chasm from us and our present state, that neither the author's, nor even my own researches, would bo-

able to throw the requisite bridge across, so as to open again a way for general communication with that "lost word" of the primitive language. That would be for instance the language to be called really primitive in the right sense, which Moses in the passage above mentioned alludes to, and which is actually meant in it according to our opinion, during the time that Adam still possessed the divine fiat in nature ; that he executed this sway of nature, not indeed by his own power and authority, but by God's will and license, under Jehovah's guidance and assistance, till he sank into that pernicious sleep through which he succumbed to the power of the senses. Later also, when man had fallen sick in his sin (Enos is the man called, and the radical signification implies "sick"), when he had found again the mysterious, miraculous name of the true God, had called upon it for help from the depth of his misery, this could not happen without his having necessarily found, recognized, and discovered the inner, essential, real names of very many natural powers and things contemporaneously with that supreme word. But all this, as more suitable to Christian philosophy, to which it unquestionably in part belongs, the author would rather have excluded from the primitively historical research. We, therefore, will not pursue this way any longer, and will immediately enter with the author on the purely historical ground, where, among the old and oldest languages actually and virtually known to us, the difference between the polysyllabic and monosyllabic presents itself to us as the proper main point for the whole investigation. Here we certainly find a language of a nature completely mono-syllabic, of inconceivable old age, and, at the same time, of the most artificial formation,—namely, the Chinese. On this side, it would be difficult to decide concerning the most ancient rank of the one or the other kind, especially if considered in a merely historical point of view with respect to time. But the sole question is properly, which was the main stem and which the lateral branch. On the other hand, the question concerning the intrinsic value is easily decided. The polysyllabic languages are entirely, even into the innermost threads of the living tissue, formed organically in the roots as in the grammatical form, and that deeply pervading etymological relationship which has interwoven itself almost over the whole

surface of the earth, through all the branches of the Indian, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German languages, and which is in remoter connection also with the Phœnician and Arabian, doubtless too with the whole of the Sclavonic tongues. The monosyllabic language, on the other hand, has no really internal, organic life, but forms a mere aggregate of isolated tones, which, without inner development as it became more and more enlarged, passes off at last into an endlessly artificial system of the most arbitrary and wholly conventional language of signs, as among the Chinese, where at length the chaos of the accepted writing-ciphers must come to the succour of the indescribable poverty and ambiguity of the oral language, so as to become barely intelligible. Picture-writing, from the Mexican painting, through all the symbolico-priestly secret language of the Egyptian hieroglyphs down to the endlessly artificial cipher-chaos of the Chinese, will ever remain subordinate. Even in the author's eyes it will, who recognizes the "amazing discovery" (p. 73) of letters, as inseparably connected with the formation of the polysyllabic or organic language, and who assigns the highest antiquity to this discovery of writing (pp. 73 and 76); nay he seems inclined to regard it as original, that is, entirely coeval with the first awaking of the human mind. The author, however, has not stated more circumstantially in what this connection consists between the polysyllabic languages and alphabetical writing, although it may undeniably be shown. Alphabetical writing is founded on a decomposing, very artificial if you will, but perhaps also from very natural causes, of each human tone into its single and simple elements. Now the formation of a language thus growing up from polysyllabic roots depends on such a discompounding of the object denoted. It is not an apish vocal imitation of the external object, an involuntary exclamation of the internal state, as in the monosyllabic languages, but a really mental comprehension of all the different inward or outward vital actions and demonstrations of power. It is polysyllabic in the first roots, which are already limbed and even words. It is, therefore, not merely uttered according to the rude total impression, but mentally analyzed according to the dynamic constituent parts and its internal elements. To these, such as they are in nature, may well correspond in varied and deep analogy the elements also of the human voice analyzed and

dissected into vowels, consonants, into the spiritual breathing and accent. This then would be the proper wonder of human language, if we otherwise wish to give sufficient weight at length to the historical proofs against a groundless theory based on old prejudice of universal and original sensuality and want of mind, in order not to deny any longer a communication of speech, originally true and essential, that is to be called really human. This was and still is far more than a play of deception and caprice, composed of animal cries, of a few images and arbitrary signs. Hence, therefore, can be first perfectly explained the inner connection, pointed out in general by the author, of alphabetical writing with polysyllabic language, as they both are based on the same dynamical analysis and taking up both of the inner elements of the human voice, and of the phenomena in life, as the object of language; they are based also on the shaping out of those elements to an organic form, a property that remains in each development to what has been so taken up in its elements and dynamically united, because the germ for it lay already in the first origin. This dynamical or vitally spiritual mode of taking up and appropriating the elements of speech is what forms the grand and essential difference between the two different classes of primitive languages, the polysyllabic-organic and the monosyllabic-aggregate languages. The author, by acknowledging the connection between alphabetical writing and the organic languages, admits at once their higher rank with respect to inward worth and spiritual contents, and to such languages belong the Indian, the Latin and Greek; then in a somewhat more remote line the German and Persian; still more remotely and partly in another manner the Arabico-Syriac and Sclavonic tongues. But the author cannot refuse them either the chief rank with respect to time and age, provided that the discovery of alphabetical writing is of such high antiquity as he asserts (pp. 73 and 76), or if it was perhaps original, as he appears to assume. The existence of primitives old original languages of the monosyllabic class, which class must ever be regarded as a branch and offshoot of that first lingual stem, can easily be explained, as soon as we concede "a sinking back of language" as conceivable, such as the author does, who meets us here half way (p. 76), and who explains not less ingeniously than satisfactorily that "sinking back of language" by the "forgetting of writing," namely, of

alphabetical characters, inseparable from it. Here, however, we must remember, that that fall of the mind, attributable perhaps to many and different causes, will occasion also a decadence of language, and that this therefore may take place in more ways than one. As far as the signs of writing are concerned, the author might have mentioned, besides the picture-writing, and the elementary signs, or letters, another kind also of mathematical, or real signs, which render the thought or object entirely by one sign, corresponding to the essence of the thing itself, without pictorial reference or arbitrary assumption. To these belong the Indian decimal figures, imparted to us through the medium of the Arabs ; a discovery, which deserves no less to be named astonishing, than that of literal characters. At least we cannot help seeing how this entirely corresponds to a real sign in the straight stroke as mark of unity, in the three-pronged figure of the three ; the denoting of nought by the circle is also especially remarkable, although all the figures have either not preserved their original form, or this is no longer to be recognized in them. The Indian decimal figures are then distinguished from those signs of notation that are composed, like the Roman ones, of strokes placed alongside of another, or of initial letters, by this, that these ever form merely an aggregate of numbers mechanically placed near one another, whereas in the Indian decimal system the true inner elements of all number are vividly and dynamically seized and organically disposed. Hence, also, the whole world of numbers can be turned to account with so much life and wonderful efficacy in comparison with the pitiful aid that is derived from a mechanical notation of numbers. In this respect the decimal arithmetic has precisely the same relation to the mechanical arithmetic notation, that the elementary notation of alphabetical writing has to the typical or conventional word-writing ; there is a great analogy between the two. To this class belong also the remarkable metaphysico-mathematical real signs of the Chinese, which depend on the same cause. I mean the eighth Koua and symbols composed of them, consisting of one straight and one broken line, as signs of unity and duality (the Platonic *ērepol*), from which, step by step, several compositions, according to the manifold, mathematically possible cases, are formed with a very ingenious signification.

But since this metaphysical linear writing could by no means suffice for the whole extent of the language and the abundance of the phenomena in life to be denoted, it came then, notwithstanding the absence of the elementary signs, to that immeasurable chaos of ciphers which distinguishes the Chinese language from all others. These dynamic real signs are assuredly not to be overlooked in any future investigation into the origin and the original nature of alphabetical writing, for they in all that is essential stand probably much nearer to it than every hieroglyphical or pictorial writing. We do not mean to deny that many alphabets contain to some extent individual traces of a pictorial nature. How far the arrow-headed writing entirely belongs to one of these kinds, or perhaps forms a medial link and a point of transition from the one mode of typifying a language to the other, cannot yet be regarded as definitively ascertained.

If now the question is, in a merely historical sense, concerning a human primitive language, we must entirely set aside what has been alluded to above concerning the essence of the creatively active word in a philosophical sense, or what occurs in old theology. It is also decidedly not unknown to the Zendavesta, but is mentioned there by the name of Honover, the Zend appellation for that metaphysical idea of the eternal word, which in all that is essential agrees with the Mosaic and Christian idea of the divine fiat. Historically taken, the primitive language, according to what has been said above, can only be sought for in the class of the organically formed languages, since we must recognize this as the main stem and parent-stock of human languages, in accordance with all that the author himself concedes. Not that any one in particular among these is to be fixed upon, as being that one, from which all the rest must have been derived, as perhaps something, that I said in my work on India about the Sanscrit, has been misunderstood contrary to my intention, or as, perhaps, our author might appear, here and there, inclined to assign to the Zend language the first place at all events among all the others, as likewise to the Zend tradition the greatest age. In the comparative analysis, either directed to etymological concordance, or to the structure of grammatical configuration, when applied to the whole class of all organic languages, all of which are intimately allied to

one another, and which form throughout the dialects of the most different nations only one grand family of tongues, the sole question can be, which of them is most organically formed, which least have lost this structure, and have most preserved that character in simple regularity. By this standard we can easily distribute into different classes of approximation the collective organically-formed languages. This, too, without wishing to find out, with positive certainty in useless efforts or from one-sided partiality, the common parent and radical language itself, as it was spoken in the land of Eri, or in any other primeval country after the last catastrophe in nature. According to the present state of our actual knowledge of language, both in comparative grammar and historically-founded etymology, there belong to the first class of approximation to the organic primitive or parental language, the Sanscrit or Old-Indian, in particular, together with the Latin, and also the Greek. I must observe here, that our philologists of classical antiquity, who have gone into those investigations, consider the Latin as merely allied, but at the same time an elder form of the Greek. The Persian, and with it all the German and Gothic languages, form then a second class. The Slavonic tongues, whether more profound judges wish to place them in the first or second class, belong in every case to the organic kind. To this family the Arabico-Syriac tongues appertain only in a remoter degree, and with many modifications. Now where the Zend language is to be placed in this series, and to which class it belongs, is, from the materials extant, not easy to decide with certainty. This will be especially the case, so long as we know so little of what is the most important, its grammar and construction, so as to be able to come to a decision respecting its organic constitution and formation.

The author mentions several times its close affinity to the Indian language, and appears even to consider it as a mere dialect of the latter. Now the first question is, whether this affinity is a very close and original one, or merely one more remote; which, indeed, may be asserted also of ten or twenty other languages. I wish to decide nothing here, but merely start doubts, and mention the reasons on both sides from what has been given. Of the little that is known concerning the construction and grammar of the Zend language, Anquetil

himself has adduced some extremely remarkable analogies in the declension to the Georgian language (in the Caucasian country); some of it coincides with Indian forms. Even in the alphabet of the Zend language there is much that is peculiar; for instance, in the great number of the letters, in the special character of the long vowels, the including the nasal *an* among the latter, the annexing of the letter *u* to other consonants, which reminds us of the construction of the Indian system of writing, and is only found again in this language. In the Zend dictionary, published by Anquetil, there is a considerable number of words undeniably Indian; and with a more complete knowledge of the latter language, with greater means for acquiring it than I possess, perhaps many more would be found, without giving way to any uncertain conjectures. A considerable number of these words are such as express the first and most common wants. They are also in their form, and in the changes they undergo, perfectly similar to the Indian; though for the most part, with such exception, the termination and formation of words in the Zend language appear very peculiar and different. Some others are technical words from the Sanscrit, which have passed over almost wholly unchanged; they bear less the character of roots originally common to both, than of technical words borrowed from the other; among them, in particular, some metaphysical ones are remarkable,* because they might lead to suppositions concerning the connection or mutual influence of the doctrine and the system. That the Zend language belongs to the mixed ones, appears also to be confirmed by the dictionary, from the circumstance that it contains, together with the words of Indian affinity, so large a number in common with the Pehlvi language, this too quite independent of the religious terms. Now should it be asserted that all these words were first adopted by the Pehlvi from the Zend, this would be deciding the question before the investigation. Among the religious words of the Zoroastrian books only a very few can be positively shown to be allied to the Indian; if, therefore, the Zend were really an Indian dialect, we should be obliged far rather to regard

* The much spoken of *zeruane akerene*, boundless time, in the Zend books, might perhaps be nothing but the Indian *Sarvam akhyaran*—*omne indivisum*, or *indivisible*, the *πᾶν καὶ οὐ* of the Vedanta doctrine.

these words as originally belonging to the Pehlvi. It is certainly not a little singular, that while the Pehlvi language and the use of it is sufficiently confirmed in the old Persian kingdom by inscriptions and coins, the Zend language is entirely destitute of this virtual confirmation. There is also something remarkable in the dictionary that belongs to this place ; namely, the totally different names for several cardinal numbers, which is usually a characteristic peculiarity of mixed languages, as in the Coptic for instance, the duplicate, partly old Egyptian, partly Grecian names for the first numerals.* Should now the Zend language, as it has become known to us, be a mixed dialect of more recent origin, we should most naturally have to look for its seat in the north-western frontier regions of India, where then most clearly that land, extending far and wide between India and Persia from Little Thibet, called by the ancient name of Sind, and which is given to the whole fluvial district of the Indas (qui incolis Sindus appellatus), offers in the very name even a coincidence. It is not, it must be confessed, an entirely complete one ; since the initial consonant, though very similar in sound, is carefully discriminated in the notation of the Oriental languages. Nevertheless the analogy is no more removed entirely than the higher signification of the word Zend, which means living, in the sense that the Zend people were such. It implies, that they, by the recognition of the true light, alone veritably lived ; and that the Zend books are those in which this doctrine of the true life is described and revealed, &c. &c. There are too many examples in Asiatic antiquity, that a higher signification and consecration have been thus given to the real name of a

* Thus besides its *drei* (three) and *threitim* (third), exactly as in the Indo-Latin-German family, there is also for the same number three, the word *se* as in the Pehlvi, and then the exotic word *teachro* entirely foreign to the others. Moreover, *peantche* (five), as in the Indian and Persian, *desé* (for ten), just as in the family of tongues above alluded to ; but then, quite independent of these, *pokhdé* (five), and *mro* (ten), together with the Indo-Latin *doué* (two), there is also *besch* (two), corresponding to the Latin *bis* ; and this root is remarkable in the form *belim* (second), which is also allied to the German *beid-e* (both). The Zend word *tchelvere* (four) is connected with several languages, as *chatur*, Ind. ; *quatuor*, Lat. ; *tschetyr*, Slav. Many of these numerals in the Zend dictionary are connected with the Indo-Latin-Persian-German family ; nevertheless *kshouasch* (six) seems to be entirely foreign.

geographically defined land by means of a religious allusion, or that the consecrated name has been also transferred and lastingly attached to the actual land. That which, however, decides against this supposition, is the circumstance that nothing whatever is found of a Zend language and a Zend people in the definitive historical sense in the sources, neither in the Zoroastrian, nor in the new Persian ones that are founded on old tradition, and on documents. The Zend is always used in the symbolico-religious sense, for designating the true "life" of those possessing the right knowledge, the doctrine of Zoroaster, and of still older masters; their revelation of this life, and also for signalizing the supporters of it, or the participants in the revelation of the true life. This entire question of the relationship of the so-called Zend language, and a judgment concerning its construction, cannot be formed satisfactorily, till we possess a grammar of it. Then, perhaps, all these doubts, which I only produce as such, will be perhaps cleared up, and the so-called Zend language may preserve and justify, according to the views of the author, its full rank as a primitively old and original language closely related to the Indian. Independently of this, it is self-evident, from the whole context, that Zoroaster's doctrine and books were diffused among several nations, that belonged to the great Persian empire, were, consequently, also translated with great probability into several languages. Nothing disadvantageous for the genuineness of the tradition ensues, in whatever language the fragments may happen to have been preserved. The sense of documents, regarded as holy, is not easily corrupted essentially by pure translation; but, on the other hand, it is seriously endangered by any intentional alteration. Together with the grammar, nothing would be so desirable, as the original copy or impression of the whole, or at all events of a considerable portion of the text in the original language; for the few verses, which have been communicated to us (see Kleuker's Zendavesta, ii. p. 48), disclose to us alone far more than many individual words. Now, among these verses, there are decidedly some entire phrases very closely allied to the Indian, nay, some sound exactly similar.

The calling it the Zend language, usual and general as it has become, appears for the rest, judging by everything mentioned above, to be not much more appropriate than if we

were to call the language of the Mosaic books the Thora language, or the Hellenic dialect of the New Testament, the gospel language. We must inquire after the people who spoke this language, and so let us now turn from these remarks concerning the primitive language, and the language of the Zoroastrian books, as the connection of the subject naturally leads us, to what the author adduces respecting the primitive people and the Zend people, their original native seat, as likewise their migrations from this primitive country into other regions upon the evidence and authority of the Zoroastrian books.—“The Zend people,” he quotes from one of them (p. 21), “dwelt” (in the happy primeval period before the existence of winter and the migrations into warmer lower districts) “in the land of Eri, Ari.”—The name of “Zend people,” I do not find in the passage quoted; but the question is concerning the first people and human race, according to the doctrine of these books and this tradition. Now, how was this race or nation called, or what people was it, that inhabited the land of Ari? The ancients named them, after the land itself, the people of the Arians. There is no doubt that the land Eeriene is identical with the province Aria, or Ariana, of the Greeks, the modern Chorasan. I refer for the last assertion to the judgment of a learned friend, whose authority in everything connected with Persian antiquities is of the greatest and acknowledged value, the Aulic counsellor, Von Hammer, who has had the kindness to communicate to me his opinion upon this point, but who at the same time remarked, that also Ver, which in the Shah-name is called Iran, must by no means be confounded with Persia. The city, however, of Ver-ene, cannot be Persepolis, as Anquetil very truly asserts, but is the Hekatompylos of the Greeks, the capital of ancient Parthia; the Albordi is the mountain range in Chorasan, in a more extended sense, however, the whole mountain chain from Caucasus to the Himalaya. The province Aria is also, no doubt, a mountainous highland country, such as Eeriene is described, and the streams which water Bactria and Sogdiana partly descend from the Paropamisus. This exactly agrees with the passage which the author cites (p. 25). For the rest Aria may have had, in the historical sense even, a greater importance and extent than the limitation and site

which are assigned to this province in the geographical system of the Greeks. A Grecian author himself speaks (see Creuzer, Symbol. vol. i. p. 698, note 40, and p. 736, note 90) of "the whole Arian race" (*παν το Αρειον γένος*), as of a great and widely-diffused people. In the Indian code of Menu, an almost unmeasured extent, through the Indian northern mountains, as far as the East and West seas, is assigned to Ariaverta, the land of the Arians.

Let us now remember, that the Medes from the most ancient times were called Arians, i.e. that the Medes were a people of the "great Arian race," and that they assumed the Median name at a later period. Much that was hitherto dark and inexplicable now suddenly becomes clear. We need no longer reject the positive historical evidence, that Zoroaster was a Mede, while the Zend books constantly allude to Eriene, since the apparent contradiction ceases to exist. What we have hitherto called the Zend language, would, perhaps, in accordance with what those Zoroastrian sources themselves reveal concerning the real original land and race where this doctrine obtained, be more appropriately recognized and considered as the Arian language, or if it be preferred, as the East-Median in opposition to the West-Median Pehlvi language. This, however, is supposing what has hitherto been termed the Zend language, and which we define as the Arian, should turn out, upon a more intimate knowledge of it, to be an old original language, and not a mixed dialect of more recent origin. The name, too, of this great Arian people, is very remarkable. The Indian root, *Ari*, which derivation seems to be the best, signifies something admirable and distinguished, glorious, that which is "egregium." A warlike, heroic people is always inclined to give itself epithets of a like nature, and in this sense. Thus the other West-Median name, *Pehlavan*, signifies a hero. The Persians called their heroic ancestors *Artæans*, which name has some resemblance to that of the Arians, but to which we by no means wish to ascribe any etymological value. Derived from an entirely different root, but with a similar allusion and meaning in the name, may be added to the instances just given the neighbouring people of the Aspians, on the eastern slope of the Paropamisus, towards the Indus. It is not difficult to explain this word, for since

aspo, asp means in the Indian and the Persian, as also in the Zend or Ari, a horse, the transition (as in the Homeric *ἵππος*) is here easily found. Warlike, horse-compelling nations have been often called, or call themselves, by a popular name of this description, and as in this instance. I, however, have introduced the name of Aspian people here, because that wide-spread appellation, *asp*, so constantly occurs in the old generic names of the Zoroastrian books, and the Median-Persian heroic saga, which is certainly deserving of attention. The name of Arians is allied too in another way, which much more immediately concerns us. That Indian root, Ari, is decidedly and indisputably a German one also, actually existing in the language, and still obtaining in life, if we can speak in this manner of "Ehre" (honour). According to our analogy of language, and to the present form of this root, that popular name would be tantamount as it were to the honours, that is, the honourable, the noble. Precisely in this way the West German tribes were named "Erben" (heirs), or "Wehren" (defenders), as conveying the idea of free inhabitants of the land and men wearing arms, with the right to do so; this name, indeed, was applied to the whole people. In the earlier and Gothic form that root was similarly pronounced in German, *ari*, or *ario*. All those who have attentively observed how widely spread and how prevalent this root, *ari*, or *ario*, is, in the old German history and mythic tradition, among so many heroic and generic names, and elsewhere, will not be surprised when I add, that I have for a long time entertained the historical supposition, and for which I have found confirmation from many sources, that we should seek for our German ancestors while they were still in Asia, especially under the name of Arians; or to express it more appropriately, with the Greeks, as cited above, under "the whole great Arian family." By this means the old saga and opinion relative to the relationship of the Germans, or German and Gothic tribes, with the Persians, would all at once receive a totally new light, and a definite historical point of connection. To the circumstance, that some German roots and words, striking from their complete similarity, are found in the dictionary of the Zend, or, as I would now prefer saying, Ari language, I will not attach any further importance, because resemblances and pecu-

liarities of this sort are often seen among nations very remote from and entirely unconnected with each other. That Chovaresm, also, according to Mirchond (see Hammer's History of Persian Arts of Speech, p. 137), was once called Jermania, striking as it is when compared with what Herodotus mentions of an old Persian race of Germans, as one of the three agricultural tribes (see Hammer's remark as paged above), we will not yet deem as conclusive, since the similarity of the name may be accidental, like as the seeming resemblance of the name to the Indian Samanæans, which means something quite different, and denotes the votaries of Buddha, as opposed to the followers of Brahma. The more especially so, since the name of Germans, so widely diffused since, arose much later on the Western Roman frontier of Old Saxony, as is evidenced historically and undeniably. But I do regard as far more remarkable, that Bokhara, according to Mirchond (see Hammer as cited above), "in the language of the ancient Magi," means the gathering-place of the sciences, and that in Ulfilas, as is well known, Bokareis should mean a learned man. I do not pretend to deny that I do certainly consider myself warranted in regarding the land of Chovaresm and Bokhara as the first historically known dwelling-place, shown at least to be probable, of our Teutonic ancestors in Asia. During the course of my observations respecting the Arian people and their name, I did not confine myself solely to the threads of the etymological relationship of language, and to the delight of weaving these any longer; no, something else results from the investigation, which in another respect also is historically very important. Nothing, in fact, is so essential, or throws so much light on researches touching an ancient people (I speak of those Asiatic and European ones, who have a tradition and traces of an olden culture), as first of all to ascertain whether it was a priest-people, as the Indians, Egyptians, Heturians, or a warrior-people, that is, a people founded by the warrior-caste, or where this latter preserved its pre-eminence. Not that the warrior nations had no priests, and we know that the priestly nations, named above, had their war-caste also; it is the dominant element that we must regard. We leave out of consideration here the trading nations, and generally all those, where any other third element, except the two named, has produced the

dominant character in all the institutions of life. The two chief classes in the whole of the ancient world, as known to us, are formed by the sacerdotal nations, and by the warlike nations of heroes or nobles. The last are mostly, or at all events very frequently, designated as such by their very names. Thus in the present day robber tribes in India, addicted to war, have denominations of this nature, for the Mahrattas (great Rajahs) and the Rajpoots (sons of the Rajahs) are such, and derived from the war-caste. A similar signification is conveyed by the two most comprehensive names of the old German tribes : Teutons, that is, Thuidans, which in the Gothic means kings, princes, masters, lords ; and Goths, that is, nobles (as Gothakunds of noble descent). Now precisely in this way the old Medes were called Pehlvan, that is, heroes, as then it is certain the Medes of Zoroaster were a noble heroic nation of this description. The name of Arians means the same, from whom the Medes descended, as we explained above from the Indian root the signification of this name, and proved it even in the old German language.

The old institution of castes, to which we have been led in the course of the investigation, is touched upon by the author as cursorily (p. 49) as it is unsatisfactory. His opinion is, that they proceeded from a distribution and parcelling out of the Indian races that took place originally at the first immigration ; but he offers us, in point of fact, no materials for pursuing this branch of inquiry further with him. To be able to do this, it would be requisite for us to know, in the first place, whether he considers the institution of castes as old, and, in its first outlines at least, antediluvian, or completed immediately after the great catastrophe ; or whether he deems it modern, and not founded till after the origin of nations and states. As for the description of the confused and parcelled-out condition of the Indians, we do not know where the author derived his reasons from. One thing is at least certain, that his views of the Indians themselves are destitute of all clearness and precision. Considering the number of sources, and the chronology that is not historical, from which we have never thoroughly disengaged ourselves during the Indian investigations, considering also the conflicting opinions of the learned in Europe on this subject and others, this is not difficult to understand, so long as there is a

want of a critical support and historical prop for enabling us to arrange and dispose the whole. The one grand contradiction, however, that prevails throughout Indian tradition and collective literature, namely, between the religion of Brahma and the doctrine of Buddha, which even the Greeks in Alexander's time found there, in the two sects or religious parties of the Bramins and the Samanæans, may certainly be historically cleared up and explained away. This fact, which has altered and split up everything in India, and in the people who, in their mental culture, are, or were, dependent on India, forms now that very historical support by means of which light and order first pervade the whole, as I shall attempt to show in another place.*

The question, too, concerning the primitive state, and how it was constituted, about which Hüllman has given us lately such interesting inquiries, has been quite neglected by the author, although he so carefully endeavours to ascertain the entire primitive condition both in religion and language, as also with respect to the land originally inhabited by the first human race. This omission of the state, in his investigations, may be perhaps less regretted, since he seems not to have as yet perceived the proper point for commencing them from. Here, before all things, it would be incumbent to solve and decide the question, so important in many respects, whether the different ranks—that is, in the old world—whether the castes, in short, were older, or whether the state was. I use

* In what relates to the objections which the author has advanced in his former work ("On the Age and Value of some Oriental Records") against the genuineness and age of Menu's Indian Code already alluded to further back, with respect to Sir W. Jones's and my declaration in the treatise on the language and wisdom of the Indians; I will simply remark here on this occasion, that those objections are in so far well founded, that the question cannot be at all, whether this work first proceeded from Menu, since the contrary is proved by the work itself. The judgment of Sir W. Jones was principally founded on the antiquity of the language, and when I at that time subscribed to the judgment and great authority of Jones on this point, I for the present, and until further reasons be adduced, see no grounds for not doing so still. I grant that it is nothing but a relatively great age, that can be concluded on from the antiquity of the language; but that the Indian Code of Menu, notwithstanding this great limitation of the supposed great age, may well be a source of no mean importance for old tradition and historical knowledge, the author himself seems to recognize, since he on several occasions resorts to and uses it as such.

the word "state" in its proper signification, as a peace-institution guaranteed by the power of war, and which, although it is at the same time founded on internal peace, is nevertheless immediately directed to external peace or war; and although of mutable circumference or extent, has nevertheless, as a moral individual thing, its boundaries strictly closed against everything external. In point of fact, the universal and favourite expression of "primitive people" is not correct, if we, as the author in the main decidedly does, take our departure from the unity of descent; for in that case there can be no question of a primitive people, but only of a primitive or original stock, from which all nations are derived, and by which we mean therefore nothing but the condition of mankind that obtained before the distribution of man into nations, and previous to the origin of any individual people. They, it is true, who do not take their departure from one common descent, but assume that man has sprung forth everywhere from the earth, differently fashioned according to the different nature of the country, are on the other hand quite right in their sense of the term when they speak of primitive races in the plural number, since they refuse to acknowledge the primitively historical unity, and will not allow it to have ever existed. Now with the author, who manifestly gives the preference to the system of unity, and who endeavours to show, how all nations emigrated and are descended from one primeval land (the central high land of Asia), it is therefore only an inconsistency when he also speaks at times (pp. 48 and 52) of primitive peoples, that are said to have preserved themselves here and there in the deep valleys of the great range of lofty mountains, like a genus of animals in solitary districts, that has indeed grown scarce, but which is still found. If we do not mistake, he has borrowed this opinion from Ritter, in other respects a very excellent geographical writer, who is, however, still something touched with that hypothesis of Antochthones. This, too, notwithstanding the wealth, so genially amassed by himself, of ethnographic facts and remarks, in his grand arranged outlines, leads us palpably and evidently back to an original unity of all nations derived from the three main parent stocks.

If we now return to the primeval land of Eerieue, as it is

designated in the Zendavesta, it is manifest, by the mode in which the other countries are adjoined to it and ranged in a line around it, that it is used in a sense perfectly historically defined, and bounded with geographical accuracy. It is at the same time set down in the midst of other countries as the parent land of the Arian people, as the main land of their origin. Now, according to the author's own rule, we must carefully discriminate before all things in every old historical tradition the Universal from what is special, nationally peculiar and geographically local. Thus, in the Zend saga, for instance, Jemjid is a connecting point of this description with the Universal, since Shem, not only in this tradition, but also in the Mosaic and other Asiatic ones, takes so important a place in the derivation and history of the descent of nations. Afterwards there are some more detached but valuable indications, as for instance, a very beautiful indication is contained in that myth of the nine human pairs, who wandered across the sea; consequently, as the author explains it (pp. 54 and 55), may have, perhaps, first peopled Africa. Everything, however, seems to be local in the geographical views given of the world and various lands in the Zendavesta. First of all, Eerieene, or the Ari land, is accurately defined the original country of the Arians, the precise Aria of the ancients. Among the fifteen blessed regions and spots that are ranged around this centre, the first are evidently, and without a shadow of doubt, Sogdiana and Bactria. Among those that follow, many are doubtful and capable of being explained in more ways than one. Though they are not situated to the south of that centre in a geographical sense, they may, nevertheless, in a climatical sense, as valleys and low lands, be described as warmer ones in comparison with the old mountainous seat of nativity,—the cradle of the race. The eastern provinces are very conspicuous; namely, the Sind regions of Cabool and Lahore, or the Punjaub; after them, Candahar also, the Arachosia of the ancients, and the country near the river Hindmend. The design of the draw-up of the old record was, perhaps, less directed to the representing of "the whole great Arian family of nations" in their common descent, which at all events was certainly not his only object. It seems far more probable to have been his intention at the same time to comprehend and describe, in his



geographical views of the earth, the great Median empire also, which coming after the Assyrian, preceded the Persian in its greatest extent, inclusive not only of the nations and countries that formed it, but also of those by which it was bounded. It is remarkable in this geographical description, that according to the more correct interpretation of Ver and Verene, as alluded to further back, Persis is given quite as little as Babylonia, or Susiana. Of Assyria, too, only the most northerly part, on the confines of Armenia, is introduced in a very ambiguous way, but no mention is made of it in its higher sense of the Assyrian empire. The extreme frontier of this great extent, as designated in that description, is formed towards the west by Armenia; that is to say, if the sixteenth blessed region, Rengheiao,* in Pehlvi Arvestanove, is rightly explained as the northern portion of Assyria contiguous to Armenia. (Kleuker, vol. ii. p. 303.) From what has been here advanced, it appears now evidently to follow, that this geographical description in the Zendavesta is neither an Assyro-Babylonian, nor a Persian (taken from the empire as founded by Cyrus), but most decidedly a Median one. If this point could be regarded as certain, then much light would be thrown upon the whole, notwithstanding great difficulty and obscurity still hang over isolated parts. It would be very desirable if some learned men, provided with all the proper sources that explain the ancient geography of Asia, and deeply versed in Oriental languages, would thoroughly explain this entire Median list of countries, such as it is found in the Vendidad (Fargard, i., in Kleuker, part ii. pp. 299, 304), from which the author, Mr. Rhode, only selects what best corresponds to his hypothesis. Then a definite judgment could be come to, whether there was any reason for assuming a twofold and double Ari land and Eeriene. One, according to the author, is the first and original native country of the Arians in the north or north-west part of Sogdiana; but which as yet is mere hypothesis. The other is the main central land of the Median empire, founded by the parent stock of the Arians, namely, the Aria of the ancients, and which is both historically and geographically certain. Towards the north-west this Medo-Arian descrip-

* According to Görre, in his translation just published of the Schahname, Introd. p. xlxi., Rengheis is the province Zarangia, Sareng.

tion in the Zendavesta extends, as already observed, in no case further than up to Armenia, or as far as the north part of Assyria. The other terminal point towards the south-east is, on the other hand, more clearly defined. It is formed by the fifteenth blessed region, Hapte Heands, or the seven Indias, respecting which the record adds, remarkably enough, that this blissful region "surpasses all the other kingdoms of the world in size and extent." This very circumstance obliges us to regard the compilation of these books as having taken place in the neighbourhood of India, for only near the spot could so distinct and complete an idea have been formed of the greatness, population, and importance of this region of the globe. The Arian race, however, is also described in an Indian source, quite clearly in my eyes, as closely allied to the Indian, both by descent and language. In that often-discussed passage of Menu's code (criticised in the author's other work, "On the Age and Value of some Oriental Records," p. 64), where the question regards the alienation from the Bramins, the neglect of Braminical manners and usages, the warrior-castes that had thrown off the yoke of civilization, and the nations that sprang from them, it says at the conclusion, "All these are Dasyus (or predatory tribes living in a state of war), whether they speak the language of the Mlechhas, or that of the Aryas." The Mlechhas are barbarian tribes, alien to the Indians, both in race and language. Now since these are mentioned in evident contradistinction to the Arians, it is tantamount to saying, they are all savage and desperate robber tribes, whether they are barbarians, or even Arians, the latter being actually allied to the Indians both in race and language.

Now, if the author takes his Eriene historically in a far more extended sense than the Zendavesta does, and regards it as the whole of the primitive land after the Flood, therefore the central high land of Asia, no objection in this respect is to be made. Only he ought then to remain steadfast to this comprehensive view of his, and not limit it again himself in a partial manner. For it is self-evident, that in the primitively historical tradition of each nation, according to the particular locality, the point situated nearest to that nation has the greatest importance assigned to it. The author himself grants the possibility, that the Caucasus may have formed

"a second asylum" (p. 29), and that, generally speaking, there may have been "more than one primitive land" (p. 28). We should prefer giving at once to *one* primitive land a greater extent, and not confining it within such narrow limits. It must also not be overlooked, into what wide regions of the earth one and the same name for vast mountains and countries, in the old world, was often applied and extended. The name of the Caucasus gives us an instance of this, so likewise of the Imaus, and lastly of Asia itself. If, therefore, the Himalaya and the Hindukush lie nearest the Indian (p. 24), and are especially named before all others in the Indian tradition; if the Altai (p. 52) forms the pivot, as it were, for the first immigration of the North-Asiatic tribes, and the Ural designs the great, old national way (p. 53) to the west, that is, to northern and central Europe; so Moses also ought not to be passed over with such indifference, because he makes the patriarch Noah rest with the ark on Mount Ararat. Each tradition, as we see, refers on the whole but to one and the same central high land, and to one primeval Asiatic mountain-chain, in all its wide ramifications. If Anquetil's opinion were the right one, which places Eriene at the foot of the Albordi, in the land that is watered by the Kur and Araxes, the declaration of the Zendavesta, according to this interpretation, would then agree very closely with that of Moses. From what was quoted and examined into further back, this explanation relative to Eriene cannot well be admitted; but an agreement so very accurate and precise is neither to be expected nor sought for in this case. Nevertheless, where the explaining of ancient geography is coupled with so much doubt, and where the best opinion is for the most part only the more probable one, this ought to make us diffident, and not too eager, for the sake of a pre-conceived opinion, to reject any old Asiatic tradition, how much less, then, the Mosaic document.

With this remark we conclude this communication respecting the work of the author. It has, perhaps, been too lengthily drawn up. Should I have succeeded in producing a conviction in his mind, that Moses and the Genesis may be, after all, regarded also in another and different point of view from what he has hitherto done, I should rejoice, if my expectations on this score should be not deceived, or be even

surpassed. In every case my design was to examine thoroughly and seriously, excluding all partiality from the primitively-historical inquiry; to show, also, that what is only too frequently represented as entirely separate or even contradictory, when rightly understood, agrees perfectly well together. Lastly, it is indeed high time that the two witnesses of the living truth and clear knowledge of antiquity, viz. "writ and nature," should no longer be used and misused in mutual opposition, that they should lie, dead for all more exalted knowledge, neglected in the lane, abandoned to the scorn of ignorant understanding. The moment has visibly arrived when they shall rise again victoriously, as loud witnesses of the divine truth so long misunderstood, to the greater and ever greater glorification of that truth both in science and in life. It is doing but a sorry service to religion, or rather to both, when we put religion in opposition to science, to which this esoterical branch of history also so essentially belongs. Now if, in this first attempt at a profounder understanding of this subject, much should be still found that will be, perhaps, "a stumbling-block to the Jews, and to the Greeks a foolishness," as all that is conceived in a Christian manner with science for the most part is, I nevertheless know that this way, which I have attempted to point out here, will be more and more recognized, and more universally perfected, because it is the right one.